DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 201 EA 013 989

AUTHOR Tompkins, Rachel, Ed.; Kaeser, Susan, Ed.
TITLE Citizen Guide to Quality Education.
INSTITUTION Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, Cleveland.
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Jun 78
NOTE 94p.
AVAILABLE FROM Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, 517 The Arcade, Cleveland, OH 44114 ($3.00; quantity discounts).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Disabilities; *Discipline Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Magnet Schools; Nontraditional Education; Organizational Theories; *School Organization; *Special Education; *Standardized Tests
IDENTIFIERS Education for All Handicapped Children Act

ABSTRACT

A collection of five articles focuses on some of the factors that promote quality education in public elementary and secondary education. Each article is accompanied by a list of sources, resources, and exemplary schools or programs. The first, on student discipline, discusses how to organize schools in ways that encourage disciplined behavior from students, parents, teachers, and administrators. The next article reviews the theories and research on which patterns of school organization are based and presents options for school organization at the school system and building level. One optional type of school organization--magnet schools--is examined in the third article, which describes the rationale for establishing magnet schools, the issues involved, the roles of school leaders and the community, administrative requirements, and costs and other problems. The fourth article analyzes standardized tests, discusses test abuses, and offers suggestions for improving test usage. In the final article, the effects on special education of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act are discussed; included are summaries of basic information on special children, their needs, and the provisions of the law. (Author/RW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

June 1978

# Citizen Guide to Quality Education

A REPORT OF THE CITIZENS' COUNCIL FOR OHIO SCHOOLS

EA 013 989

The Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools is an independent, statewide organization devoted to raising public awareness and understanding of major issues in elementary and secondary education and supporting constructive action in dealing with them.

This report is published by the Citizens' Council as an educational service. Interpretations or conclusions expressed in the publication are those of the authors of each chapter and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Trustees of the Citizens' Council or of organizations which support Council research and publications.

Additional copies of this report are
available at $3.00 per copy from the
Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools,
517 The Arcade, Cleveland, OH 44114.
Reduced rates available for
purchase of 25 or more copies.

© Copyright 1978
Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| | Preface | iii |
| | About the Authors | iv |
| Chapter 1 | Developing Discipline with Quality Schools<br>William W. Wayson and Gay Su Pinnell | 1 |
| Chapter 2 | The Many Faces of School Organization<br>Joseph R. Rogus | 27 |
| Chapter 3 | Educational Options: Magnet Schools and Programs<br>Daniel U. Levine and Connie Campbell | 39 |
| Chapter 4 | Dilemmas of Standardized Achievement Testing<br>Rachel B. Tompkins | 55 |
| Chapter 5 | Special Education: Implementation of New Rules<br>Nancy K. Klein | 65 |

# PREFACE

For those of us who prepared this book, a quality education is one that is tailored to the learning needs of each child. A quality educational program for a school district is one that teaches **all** children in that district well—not just the easy to teach, not just the well-mannered, not just the middle income or rich, not just the majority race—but all children. That is a difficult and costly enterprise, but it is the promise of a publicly supported education system in a democratic society.

The articles in this book focus on issues that result in sorting children into separate groups in some fashion—the organization of schools, testing, discipline, and special education. By these processes schools signal to children their status within the school and through that within the larger society. They are controversial issues at all times, but particularly acute at times of desegregation.

Student discipline is cited in almost all polls as the issue of most concern to parents, teachers, administrators, and students. William Wayson and Gay Su Pinnell's article presents the case for organizing a school in ways that encourage disciplined behavior by everyone. They do not believe that long lists of rules and related punishments and increased security forces are an effective means to achieve a disciplined school or to teach children self-discipline.

School organization is a tedious topic often completely left to school professionals. The theories upon which certain organizational patterns are based and the evidence which support them are often obscured in dreary textbooks on educational administration. Joseph Rogus writes about the schemes and the research supporting them. His perspective is that no one best system exists and that slogans and pat answers should be resisted. It is the implementation of an organizational pattern and the practices of the professionals within the organization that determine whether a quality education is being delivered.

One form of school organization now in vogue are magnet schools, alternative schools, and educational options. Daniel Levine and Connie Campbell provide a thorough look at magnets in several cities. Their conclusion is both hopeful and troubling. Much good seems to flow to those students who are part of the magnet schools and such schools may serve as islands of hope in an otherwise dismal situation. Such schools, however, clearly track students and teachers and may divert resources and attention from other schools in the district. Magnets alone cannot desegregate a big city system although they can serve as one part of a larger plan.

Standardized tests are used to diagnose, place, and evaluate students. They can be used to discriminate among children in ways that are harmful. They can also be used as one tool to evaluate whether schools are achieving educational objectives and to improve instruction. Rachel Tompkins' article focuses on tests, their uses and abuses with suggestions as to how they might be better used.

The passage of the Education of All Handicapped Act or PL94-142 provides the basis for a revolution in special education. Changes will come only as school officials, board members, parents, and other citizens understand the new law and work to implement it. Nancy Klein's article provides basic information on special children, their needs, and the provisions of law.

This book was designed for the reader who might want to dip in without reading from cover to cover. The reader may be interested in only one article, or in parts of certain articles. For example, the summary of class size research in the school organization article, the summary of PL94-142 in the special education article, examples of magnet school programs, and the list of discipline techniques may serve as reference materials for some readers. The lists of resources and exemplary schools may also stand by themselves. Whatever the use, we hope this basic information will serve to make the public more knowledgeable about some of the crucial issues affecting the quality of public education.

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**Connie Campbell** is a Research Assistant at the Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education at the University of Missouri-Kansas City. She holds an M.A. in Reading and is completing work towards a Ph.D. in the same field. She has published several articles on magnet schools.

**Nancy K. Klein** is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Specialized Instructional Programs at Cleveland State University. She holds a Ph.D. in Educational Psychology from Case Western Reserve University and has been involved in a variety of education projects for retarded children including being a classroom teacher.

**Daniel U. Levine** is Director of the Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education at the University of Missouri-Kansas City. He is co-author of the book, *The Future of Big City Schools,* and has done extensive research on magnet programs. Levine holds a Ph.D. in Education from the University of Chicago.

**Gay Su Pinnell** is a former elementary teacher who now works in developing teacher education programs. She has published widely in the field of language development, reading, and open classrooms. Dr. Pinnell has a Ph.D. from Ohio State University in early and middle childhood education.

**Joseph R. Rogus** has served as a teacher, principal, and Assistant Superintendent for Instruction in the Dayton Public Schools. He earned a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Supervision from Ohio University and is an Associate Professor of Education at Cleveland State University. Rogus has done extensive consulting with schools and systems in Ohio and the Midwest.

**Rachel B. Tompkins** is the Director of the Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools. She was formerly a staff associate to the President of the University of Massachusetts and was a research assistant at the Center for Educational Policy Research, Harvard. Dr. Tompkins holds an Ed.D. in Administration, Social Policy, and Planning from Harvard University.

**William W. Wayson** is Professor and Acting Chairman of the Faculty for Educational Development at Ohio State University. He teaches courses in school discipline, staff development, and school desegregation. Before joining the faculty at OSU, Dr. Wayson was a junior high teacher in Ohio and Principal of Martin Luther King Junior School in Syracuse, New York. Wayson holds a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in Education Administration.

**The Citizen's Guide was prepared and published with support from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Rachel Tompkins and Susan Kaeser, of the Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, edited this publication.**

# Developing Discipline with Quality Schools

by
William W. Wayson and Gay Su Pinnell

Discipline is the ability to choose and maintain a constructive role in a situation.

Being disciplined is a part of being educated, and being self-disciplined is the highest form of preparation for effective citizenship.

Discipline is learned; therefore, it can be taught. It is a major goal of education, best taught when it is consciously recognized as integral to the education life within a school.

There are two basic theories of discipline based on the view of students as essentially **bad** or **good**. Although few people think students are all bad or all good, approaches to school discipline tend to fall on one or the other side of the question. Those who think people are bad will advocate programs in which discipline is imposed by outside authorities in order to control, contain, or considerably change students from "undisciplined" into "civilized" persons. In those cases, school discipline policies are lists of rules for controlling students. Discipline is separated from education; it is enforced; and it is equated with punishment. Adults maintain constant vigilance against rule infractions and present students with punishments for any infractions that are discovered. Students learn how to escape discovery.

Those who believe people to be essentially good, choose programs that capitalize upon students' ideas, skills, and aspirations to help them learn ways to solve problems in their lives. They seek ways to teach self-discipline, and their methods reflect trust in school personnel, students, and parents to adopt effective solutions to problems in the school. While some educators see discipline as something done in order to get to the curriculum, these educators see discipline as part of the curriculum.

Those who see people as essentially bad accuse the others of being "Pollyannic" and "permissive" and in turn find themselves charged with being "dictators," "bureaucrats," or "conservatives." Both groups can carry their ideas to extremes, **particularly when they are arguing about vague, general concepts and not about specific cases.** Actually, effective discipline programs reflect some of both assumptions and adapt them to individual cases.

For the purposes of this paper, discipline is the ability to size up a situation and to see what needs to be done: to see several ways of behaving in the situation; to choose one of them; and to learn from what happens. Discipline is learned and can be taught. School programs that strive to teach self-discipline are not permissive, nor are they without goals or direction. Effective programs require close attention to goals and force the educator to take great care to see that the methods employed are conducive to the goals that are sought. The measure of success is whether students conduct themselves in a productive way when there is no authority present to catch or correct them.

## THE PROBLEM IN PERSPECTIVE

Since Cain and Abel, parents have worried about disciplining their children, and even in the Golden Age of Greece Socrates spoke against the undisciplined young of the city. The worry is antique, but the anxiety has not dulled for modern parents and teachers.

Today, laypersons and educators perceive the lack of discipline as a problem in public schools. According to seven of the last eight "Annual Gallup Polls of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools" the American public considers "lack of discipline" the biggest problem for public schools. The October, 1976, poll showed that 22 percent of the respondents were concerned about discipline—seven percent more than the second-place concern. Responding to related questions, 50 percent reported that "enforcing stricter discipline" would do the most to improve the quality of public education; 49 percent felt that test scores had declined because "society is becoming too permissive"; 47 percent said they would like to serve on a committee working on "discipline and related problems"; and the majority reported "the ability to discipline, to be firm and fair" as the second most desirable trait teachers could have.

Teachers also show anxiety about discipline. Ohio State University researchers Donald Cruickshank and Betty Myers, studying teachers' typical problems, report that "discipline and control" are considered major problems by teachers in all kinds of schools and communities, in all types of classes, and across all levels of age and preparation.

Clearly, some kind of problem exists. But the expressed concerns do not define the problem. In fact, discipline has been discussed in a most undisciplined fashion in recent years. Discipline can be improved more easily if some objective terms are used, and if emotional issues are clarified. Several points are important:

1. Small but annoying behaviors are the major problems of school discipline.
2. Violent behavior is a very minor part of school life.
3. Defining vague terms and separating serious from trivial behaviors are very important for fair discipline.
4. Differing attitudes among administrators, teachers, parents, and students lead to confusion, misunderstanding, and sometimes greater discipline problems.
5. Desegregating schools have particular discipline problems, mostly derived from the staff's lack of familiarity with new students and their "style".

Objective studies consistently show that the major discipline problems in public schools are small but annoying things. For example, a study by Coates and Thoreson (1976) summarizes some problems as seen by teachers:

. . . children chewing gum, getting out of seats and walking around the room; coming to school without homework; talking and making noise while the teacher is trying to teach; making constant comments; running out of the classroom.

. . . a boy saying, "I won't do it" when teacher gives instructions; students not paying attention as teacher gives directions; student becoming belligerent in response to corrections; two students fighting over a basketball.

Assistant principals from junior and senior high schools in a large city which was desegregated several years ago verified this position. They felt harassed when teachers would send them trivial discipline problems such as cutting classes, tardiness, truancy, and not doing homework. Other violations such as being rude to teachers, not having an excuse for being in the hall, and fighting occurred with much less frequency.

Violence and vandalism in schools have consistently made the headlines, but they form a very minor portion of daily discipline problems even in large urban high schools. Only two percent of the respondents in the 1976 Gallup Report listed "violence and crime" as a major concern for their local schools. The National Education Association's (NEA) recent emphasis upon ridding schools of violence is hardly borne out by its own membership. Only three percent of a nationwide sample of teachers questioned in 1974 reported any sort of physical attack by a student; 76.8 percent of the sample said that violence was **not** a problem in their schools; and 96.8 percent felt it was not a **major** problem.

Confusing discipline problems with criminal behaviors tends to distort the issues for educators as well as the public. It often leads to policies out of proportion to real problems; it creates unnecessary anxiety among parents and educators; it undermines public confidence in the schools; and—above all—it prevents teachers, administrators, and school boards from taking sensible, educationally-sound steps to reduce the number and intensity of discipline problems.

Separating serious offenses from the trivial-but-aggravating is difficult but crucial for taking fair disciplinary actions. For example, participants in a national conference on discipline felt that the following behaviors warranted "extreme disciplinary measures": disrespect, excessive tardiness, disobedience, verbal abuse, forgery, off school grounds without permission, snowballing, dress extremes, any action socially unacceptable based on local mores, a generally negative attitude about the school community, and poor response to teacher direction. Such terms are vague and are therefore subject to abuse.

For example, some people call for extreme measures against "disrespect" until they discover that disrespect is inferred from such behaviors as:

Asking too many questions.
Wearing your hat in the hallway.
Not looking at me when I'm talking.
Rolling your eyes at me.
Sighing.
Wearing your hair in braids (boy).
Saying "yeah" or "yes" instead of "yes, sir."

Whether such actions should be considered offenses warranting extreme action is doubtful. Some of the behaviors reflect cultural differences. Others are simply trivial. Failure to be clear about what is meant by such terms as "disrespect" can lead to misdirected and counter-productive practices by school staffs.

Problems emerge when defining a general set of rules for a school because teachers, parents, administrators, and students often have different ideas about appropriate behavior. Individual values and levels of tolerance affect judgments made by teachers and administrators. What irritates or appalls one teacher may seem normal to another. For example, talking during work periods may not be noticed by one teacher but may bother another. The principal may be upset by conversational groups in the hallway while teachers enjoy talking with those groups. Parents may become unhappy when school standards are either more or less rigid than those imposed at home.

Cultural values and differences influence judgments about appropriate school behavior. Children who come from a culture different from that which dominates the school situation may have special difficulties in understanding or fulfilling expectations. For example, in some cultures, respect is signified by looking straight into the eyes of the other person, but in some black and Hispanic cultures, respect is shown by looking down or away. Such differences often cause hostility and lead to highly unfair disciplinary actions.

School personnel, even in the same school, differ (as experts do) on what to do about discipline problems. Often, little effort is made to truly reconcile differences. Creating a program which considers the whole school as an environment for teaching self-discipline depends upon the staff learning to respect and listen to each other, to be open to new learning, to work out mechanisms for solving problems, and to help rather than judge one another.

Schools often are too separated from parents and the community to create the unified approach that is best for achieving good discipline in a school. Bureaucratic barriers and economic differences inhibit communication and heighten distrust. Teachers think that parents don't care or won't discipline their kids while parents think that teachers don't care or show no interest in individual children. Relationships must promote trust and communication if an effective discipline program is to be implemented.

Discipline is a particularly acute issue in newly desegregated schools. Many educators, parents, and community members alike have expectations that black children cause discipline problems. The expectation is related to stereotypes that black children are violent. The trait has been attributed at one time or another to most groups who have large numbers who live at or near the poverty level. For example, many Americans also expect Appalachians to be hostile, sullen, and violent. Filled with such expectations, teachers and parents are ready to believe the worst about black students (or Appalachians) and are particularly subject to rumors, to misrepresented statistics about the potentiality of violence, and to exaggerated concerns about safety in the schools.

On the job, teachers or principals, superintendents or professors are likely to be fearful of black students. They have less confidence in their own capabilities to cope with real or expected misbehavior, hence they let students get away with infractions, or they see misbehavior when there is none. They frequently take actions that escalate small problems into large ones. Thus, the desegregated school is likely to get an undeserved image of undisciplined behavior or is

likely to experience an increase in disruptive behavior because of the staff's expectation of student behavior.

School teachers and administrators who wish to avoid problems in newly desegregated situations should be aware of ten "tension-breeding factors" listed by Ben Holman, Director, Community Relations Service, U.S. Justice Department, in his article "Dealing with Racial Conflicts in School" (**NASSP Bulletin**, May, 1975):

1. impediments to minority participation in extracurricular activities.
2. inappropriate placement of minority students in special education classes.
3. counseling practices that under-value the potential of minority students.
4. lack of minority representation in student government or in traditional leadership or high status positions.
5. overly restrictive student dress and grooming codes.
6. unequal application of disciplinary measures.
7. lack of a grievance mechanism that students—particularly minority students—are free to use.
8. classes that are largely segregated—whether resulting from homogeneous grouping, student course selection, or other reasons.
9. self-segregation or exclusionary practices among students.
10. differing teacher attitudes—and even body language—toward majority and minority students, whether induced by fear, prejudice, or over-compensation.

The tendency to view all schools, all problems, and all students as being the same undermines sound discipline. Coping with and preventing discipline problems requires awareness that each person, each classroom, and each school is unique. Each has a "personality" for which no single answer, technique, or method represents the most effective approach. A method which achieves little in one situation may be highly successful in another or at another time. General knowledge of alternatives and their likely effects is a start, but teachers and other school personnel must approach their situation with commitment to work with individuals and to develop procedures which are implemented and evaluated in relation to individual needs and perceptions.

## CREATING SCHOOLS THAT TEACH SELF-DISCIPLINE

Daily life within the school teaches discipline or lack of discipline. The crucial decisions about school discipline have to be made by principals and teachers at the scene. No law or policy will be effective unless local staffs are willing and able to make it effective. While boards of education and state institutions may formulate policy concerning student discipline, day-to-day decisions made by teachers, custodians, cafeteria staff, and other personnel in the school establish and perpetuate the disciplinary climate. The many schools from all types of areas who do have educationally-sound, humanely-effective discipline programs are adequate proof that such programs can be achieved.

In those schools that seem to have the best discipline, faculty members—or a significant number of them—consciously strive to create school practices that teach students to think for themselves, to accept responsibility for themselves and for life within the school, and to behave appropriately even when adults or rules are absent.

In the rush to control disruptive behavior, resources can be needlessly wasted in trying to change or dominate students. Much more is to be gained by changing elements in the school system that cause disruptive behaviors. At least four out of every five disruptions (Wayson's Rule of Thumb) are the result of some disfunction in the way the school or the classroom runs. Most readers can remember school practices that made them angry and resentful, unfair treatment that still hurts many years after graduation, teachers who could be "played off" against one another, teachers with "hang-ups" who could be frightened or manipulated, or classes so boring that "you had to do something to liven them up." Life for both faculty and students is more enjoyable and productive if those disfunctions are changed or removed. The following illustrations will help to clarify how school life can cause disruptive behavior:

1. Teachers often feel they have no say about the policies or the curriculum handed down to them. They may resent those policies and either "slack off" on the job or withdraw into their classrooms and take no responsibility for what occurs anywhere else in the school or on school premises.

2. School organization and schedules tend to isolate teachers from one another. Teachers often form "camps" and encourage student misbehavior by childishly bickering among departments or between wings, floors, or grade levels.

3. Every time the bell rings or the intercom blares a message, classrooms are disrupted for the next ten to twenty minutes.

4. The school faculty has never agreed upon what "running in the hall" means; so, some punish students for walking swiftly while others permit near-foot-races to go on. The staff splits on the question and spends the year passing rumors about the "sluffers" and the "slavedrivers" in their midst. "Hall duty" is increased and resentment follows. Most students walk; others go as fast as "the law allows."

5. No one ever told the vice-principal that he/she did not have to meet every demand by a teacher, a parent, or the downtown office; no college class taught how to deal with conflicting expectations in productive ways. So, the vice-principal, trying to please, makes enemies of everyone while nursing ulcers because of the "bad" things he/she feels compelled to do to students.

6. No one in the school sees the playground as a learning place—just an extra nuisance which gets neglected. No one feels responsible for the area; the strongest kids dominate and their values determine what other

students learn about how to behave and survive on the playground.

7. Everyone treats the bus driver as someone to get the kids to school and as an unpleasant interruption in the otherwise smooth schedule of the school. So, the driver takes it out on the students by being cold and unfriendly. Students retaliate with pranks and vandalism. The same cycle occurs with the custodial staff.

Discipline in a school is influenced strongly by the kinds of people who teach there, by the way those people relate to one another and to the problems within the school, by the way school policies and procedures treat both adults and students, and by the traditions and habits that govern what people do in the school. Seven aspects of the school are very important in teaching either good or poor discipline: (1) the way people work together to solve problems or to make decisions about how the school operates; (2) the way authority is distributed and used in the school; (3) the way rules are stated, understood and enforced; (4) the quality, layout, and utilization of the building and the grounds; (5) relationships with parents and the surrounding community; (6) the way in which personal problems are handled; and (7) the formal curriculum and the style of instruction.

The quality of both discipline and academic achievement is closely related to one or more of those influences. They all combine to make a "living curriculum" that teaches students and school personnel "how to behave around here." To the degree that they cause the school to be disruption-prone they must be fundamentally changed or disruptions will continue, **no matter what may be done to individual students who are disruptive**. Improving discipline can be accomplished best by examining those parts of school life and by improving them.

The discussion does not **blame** schools for poor discipline. No sane school person purposely tries to teach students misbehavior; but poor training experiences or lack of training, poor school organization, bad schedules, or inadequate curriculum cause many teachers and administrators unknowingly to teach poor discipline every day.

## SCHOOL DISCIPLINE AND STUDENT RIGHTS

Many things that children learn about how to live as citizens are learned in their daily school life. Discipline is one thing that is learned in the hallways, offices, cafeterias, playgrounds, and classrooms of schools. Another important principle that may be learned in every interaction in the school environment is that this is a nation governed by the belief that all people have certain "inalienable" rights which cannot be violated by any arm of government. It is not simply a concept to study, but an element **to be practiced** in school life. If no rights are respected by the school, an opportunity is lost to teach how to respect those rights in later life. At the same time, failure to apply rights can undermine a sense of fairness in the school and can be disruptive. A concern for rights also presents the opportunity to establish that people have responsibilities. The protection of rights is a compelling motive for being disciplined.

Respect for the rights of others is a central concern of American citizenship and is therefore a valuable element for life in the school setting. However, the law, and not curriculum guides, judges and not educators, have made student rights a part of life in Ohio schools in the past decade. Many of those who feel that discipline depends upon externally-imposed order have resisted the emphasis on rights. They feel threatened and believe the concern for student rights has undermined their ability to control students and maintain order. For those oriented to discipline as an element of the school environment and the product of fair treatment, student rights are a complement. Regardless of one's posture, student rights is now an important element of public education and an important dimension of discipline.

### In Loco Parentis

School officials have been able to do almost anything "reasonable" to maintain order. Until recently, the prevailing legal principle was that school boards and their employees were acting **in loco parentis** (in place of the parent) and could do nearly anything that parents could do. When parental wishes conflicted with the school's position, the courts were likely to say that the state's needs outweighed those of the parent, and the school's power was determined in some cases to be greater than the parent.

Because of abuses of that authority, combined with the fact that school authorities often did not display the intention to act on the child's behalf that would be displayed by a real parent, courts and legislatures are now less likely to allow school officials to act as unquestioned parents. The Ohio Department of Education presents the following guideline in its handbook, *Rights and Responsibilities: Administrative Guidelines* (1971):

> The concept that the school stands in **loco parentis** is at best tenuous and partially misleading. To stand **in loco parentis**, one must assume the **full** duties, responsibilities and obligations of a parent toward a minor. School teachers and administrators obviously do not support the children in their care, nor do they provide most of the tangible and intangible necessities and securities that the child finds in his home. In fact, school authorities stand in **loco parentis** only to the degree that they may act somewhat like a parent does only some of the time for the purpose of maintaining order in the educational system. No one would saddle school authorities with the full duties of parents to care for their children until the end of minority. Thus, it is misleading to term one narrow function of the school—that is, the disciplinary function—as being a function totally representative of the in **loco parentis** concept. In **loco parentis** should not, then, be the basis for defining parent-school relationships.

## New Court Cases Affirm Constitutional Rights*

Increasingly, schools are required to grant students various constitutional rights set forth in the Bill of Rights. The following decisions from the United States Supreme Court have set new legal standards that may improve the chances for educators to teach effective, self-disciplined citizenship.

The United States Supreme Court in its 1969 ruling on *Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District* declared that the First Amendment protects students' rights to free speech, including symbolic speech such as wearing armbands and buttons. The Court said,

> It can hardly be argued that either students or teachers shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the schoolhouse gate.

Quoting from the Barnette case (1943), which gave students the right not to say the Pledge of Allegiance, the judges expressed the educational value of granting rights to students. The task of educating young people for citizenship:

> is reason for scrupulous protection of constitutional freedoms of the individual if we are not to strangle the free mind at its source and teach youth to discount important principles of our government as mere platitudes.

It also presented a strong educational argument for assuring free speech in schools and classrooms:

> . . . students may not be regarded as closed-circuit recipients of only that which the State chooses to communicate. They may not be confined to the expression of those sentiments that are officially approved. In the absence of a specific showing of constitutionally valid reasons to regulate their speech, students are entitled to freedom of expression of their views . . .

The Court declared that school officials could limit student expression in some cases. Any student conduct in or out of class which,

> materially disrupts classwork or involves substantial disorder or invasion of the rights of others is, of course, not immunized by the constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech.

Nevertheless, any limitation imposed by school officials has to be administered with due process which includes giving notice and reasons to the student and granting opportunity for the student to present his or her side of the issue. School officials would have to have clear evidence that the banned speech (or symbols) would "materially and substantially interfere" with school activities. But school officials could not stifle free expression merely because they feared a disturbance:

> undifferentiated fear or apprehension of disturbance is not enough to overcome the right to freedom of expression . . . Any departure from absolute regimentation may cause trouble. Any variation from the majority's opinion may inspire fear. Any word . . . that deviates from the views of another person may start an argument or cause a disturbance. But our Constitution says we must take this risk; . . . It is this kind of openness . . . that is the basis of our national strength and of the independence and vigor of Americans . . .

*Goss v. Lopez*, a case arising in the Columbus Public Schools, was decided by the United States Supreme Court in 1975. The Court determined that students are entitled to due process prior to suspension or expulsion from school because students cannot be arbitrarily deprived of the education guaranteed by the Ohio Constitution. Furthermore, because a student's name, reputation, and future employment opportunities could be harmed by suspensions they must not be used arbitrarily.

> Having chosen to extend the right to an education . . . Ohio may not withdraw that right on grounds of misconduct (without) fundamentally fair procedures to determine whether the misconduct has occurred.
>
> 'Where a person's good name, reputation, honor, or integrity is at stake because of what the government is doing to him,' the minimal requirements of the (due process) clause must be satisfied . . .

The Court declared that a short-term suspension (from one to ten days) was not a small matter:

> . . . total exclusion from the educational process for more than a trivial period, and certainly if the suspension is for ten days, is a serious event . . .

The minimum due process procedures required for short-term supsension are: (1) the student is entitled to an oral or written notice of the charges and (2) if the student denies those charges, he or she is entitled to an explanation of the evidence and an opportunity to present his/her side of the story. Those procedures should be provided before any suspension, preferably before the student is found guilty, unless the student's presence "poses a continuing danger to persons or property or an ongoing threat of disrupting the academic process . . ." In the latter event, the student may be immediately removed, but the notice and "rudimentary hearing" should follow as soon "as practicable." The due process requirements vary with the severity of the punishment. For short-term suspensions the school officials are not required to permit the student to have a lawyer or to cross-examine witnesses, though they may choose to do so. However, more formal procedures are needed for "larger suspensions or expulsions for the remainder of the school term, or permanently . . ."

The Supreme Court decided *Wood v. Strickland* on the same day as *Goss*. The basic decision was that, in some circumstances, school board members may be sued for damages if they violate a student's constitutional rights while administering discipline:

> . . . in the specific context of school discipline, we hold that a school board member is not immune from liability for damages under (the Civil Rights Act of 1871) if he knew or reasonably should have known that the action he took within his sphere or official responsibility would violate the constitutional rights of the students affected, or if he took the action with the malicious intention to cause a deprivation of constitutional rights or other injury . . .

Two facts have to be established before the student can receive monetary damages: the student must have a clearly established constitutional right, and the board (or, presumably other school personnel acting with the board's knowledge or under its direction) must have violated those rights. Damages could only be obtained if:

> . . . the school board member has acted with such an impermissible motivation or with such disregard of

*The authors wish to acknowledge the assistance of Thomas Lasley, doctural candidate at Ohio State, for his assistance in gathering this information.

the student's clearly established constitutional rights that his action cannot reasonably be characterized as being in good faith.

The board member may not plead ignorance.

> . . . an act violating a student's constitutional rights can be no more justified by ignorance or disregard to settled, indisputable law on the part of one entrusted with supervision of students' daily lives than by the presence of actual malice . . .
>
> . . . a school board member who has voluntarily undertaken the task of supervising the operation of the school and the activities of the students, must be held to a standard of conduct based not only on permissible intentions, but also on knowledge of the basic, unquestioned constitutional rights of his charges.

In 1977 the Supreme Court ruled in the *Ingraham v. Wright* case that the Eighth Amendment of the Bill of Rights which prohibits cruel and unusual punishments, "does not apply to the paddling of children as a means of maintaining discipline in public schools." According to the Court, "in view of the low incidence of abuse, the openness of our schools, and the common law safeguards that already exist," the Fourteenth Amendment does not require due process beyond that "satisfied by Florida's preservation of common law constraints and remedies." Throughout the decision, the Court stressed that:

> The prevalent rule in this country today (allows) such force as a teacher or administrator 'reasonably believes to be necessary for (the child's) proper control, training, or education' . . . To the extent that the force is excessive or unreasonable, the educator in virtually all States is subject to possible civil and criminal liability.

And it stated the tests for "reasonableness".

> All of the circumstances are to be taken into account in determining whether the punishment is reasonable in a particular case. Among the most important considerations are the seriousness of the offense, the attitude and past behavior of the child, the nature and severity of the punishment, the age and strength of the child, and the availability of less severe but equally effective means of discipline.

Pointing out that 21 states have authorized the moderate use of corporal punishment and two have outlawed it altogether, the Court also indicated that it believed that the child is protected against unreasonable corporal punishment in all states.

Four judges disagreed on grounds that the decision on the Eighth Amendment was too broad and that a case of corporal punishment might be cruel enough to fall under its prohibition. They also doubted that states provide enough protection against unreasonable punishment if they haven't granted damages to students who were either punished unreasonably or when they were not guilty, or if they allowed school officials to punish before hearing the student's version of what happened.

## Maintaining Rights in Schools

School policies and practices should grant and protect more rights than the courts do. Court-ordered requirements fall short of what is necessary for effective education. In the *Goss* decision, the Court states that the law requires "less (due process) than a fair-minded principal would impose upon himself." In the *Ingraham* decision, the Court noted that "elimination or curtailment of corporal punishment would be welcomed by many as a social advance," even though such punishment is not unconstitutional. Many decisions dealing with dress codes or hair length show amusement if not annoyance that any officials would make mountains out of such molehills, even when the Court supports the officials' actions.

The first prerequisite for having rights is to know about them. The mere existence of a law does not mean that students or any other persons will receive the right. Local officials may not know that the law exists. They may interpret it differently from other persons. They may not agree with the law and may refuse to implement it.

Student groups or community groups can do a lot to preserve rights and to improve educational opportunities for many students by publishing handbooks which help students and others know their rights. Handbooks might show what laws and what local policies affect those rights. They should also tell how students can get their rights—who to see, what phone numbers to call, where to get legally and educationally sound advice.

Many agencies have published such handbooks. *The Student Rights Handbook for Dayton, Ohio,* prepared by the Center for the Study of Student Citizenship, Rights and Responsibilities and published by the Institute for Research and Development in Urban Areas at Central State University in Wilberforce, Ohio, is one such example. Another is the Ohio Education Department's publication, *Rights and Responsibilities: Administrator Guidelines.* The Ohio School Board's Association also has published a handy guide entitled *Student Due Process: What You Need to Know and Do.*

Many schools are teaching law both in elementary and high school classes. Teaching student rights and responsibilities is excellent content for social studies classes. The curriculum can be enhanced if the social relationships within the school are used as live case studies and laboratories for teaching and practicing American democracy.

Developing a discipline code or revising an existing one is one of the most effective ways to promote the faculty and student agreement which is the best basis for a well-disciplined school.

## Discipline Codes*

How to treat misbehaving students has been one focus for court decisions regarding student rights. In addition to due process requirements, courts have called for written codes as one way to protect students from arbitrary, prejudicial, and unfair treatment.

Discipline codes are useful—perhaps even vital—for good education in American schools; however, they can be so only if their creators give special care to their content. Legal mandates must be balanced with actions having educational value. An explicit code is crucial, but it must not be inflexible. There must be room to consider individual circumstances as legislatures have allowed in criminal proceedings. A code loses effectiveness if it prescribes rigid formulas and provides no means for adapting consequences to individual circumstances.

A number of model codes have been developed which attempt to provide the fair treatment needed for a just code.

**The entire section on discipline codes was prepared by William Wayson who is solely responsible for its contents.*

A Phi Delta Kappa Task Force developed a "Model Student Code" (*Phi Delta Kappan*, December, 1974) which was modified slightly and included in the *School Suspensions* report by the Children's Defense Fund as a "Sample Discipline Code." That Code takes into account the rights of children as they have been established to date by the U. S. Supreme Court and other lower courts. It has influenced many school policies created in response to *Goss* and *Strickland* or in response to federal requirements that each district should have a published code.

However, the PDK code is not an exemplary discipline code. It meets the requirements of law but not the requirements for becoming an educational tool whose administration could teach students and teachers to exercise self-discipline. A complete code would include several additions:

1. Items should include the responsibility for school officials to set a limit upon the length of suspension and to permit the student to return to school whether or not a parent comes to school.
2. The code should clarify that suspension is not the **automatic** consequence of prohibited behaviors, though it may be a possible consequence.
3. A new section guaranteeing the right to voluntary transfer to another school without prejudice and within minimal procedural guidelines should be established.
4. Each section describing hearing procedures should include the right to examine evidence and should spell out what steps would be taken if school officials or other adults were found to be in error.
5. The code should assure staff development and elimination of conditions causing discipline problems, including a section requiring school staffs to devise means to systematically identify problems in their buildings and among their staffs which might contribute to discipline problems, and to report annually upon the procedures adopted to correct those problems and with what success.
6. A code should have sections on maintaining normal classroom discipline, providing safeguards against humiliation or other miseducational practices, and assuring assistance to teachers who need personal or professional help to develop educational processes for maintaining necessary controls in the classroom.

The proposed code might also outline student and faculty rights such as the Bill of Rights adopted by the Metropolitan School of Columbus, Ohio, and used in several schools as a basis for promoting an effective learning atmosphere through shared responsibility for all persons (staff and students alike) in the school community. It is useful only if used for dealing with disruptive behavior and only if it is applied equally to adults and students.

The booklet, *Rights and Responsibilities: Administrative Guidelines* published by the Ohio Department of Education contains sound advice, basic legal principles, and guidelines that generally should lead to a positive school atmosphere. The Department does not try to spell out a comprehensive program dealing with the range of "more-than-annoying" discipline problems that might arise, especially in a high school.

The recommended code, taken by itself, illustrates a major fault with codes: they tend to deal so much with prohibitions that they give a negative tone to the discipline problem. When codes are limited to prohibitions, they make it appear that disturbances occur more frequently and with greater intensity than they really do. The negative tone can affect the school and the system. Educational codes should contain as many affirmative sections as possible.

### A Bill of Rights for Teaching Self-Discipline

1. All people in a school have a *right to learn* without being disturbed.
2. All people have a right to come to school and and to be in school without being *afraid*.
3. All people in a school have a *right to ask questions* until they clearly understand what is being said.
4. All people have a right to know what they are *supposed to do before they can be criticized* for not doing it.
5. All people have a right to criticize any action affecting them so long as the criticism is *fair* and so long as it is said in a way that can correct the situation without *hurting innocent people*.
6. All people in a school have a right to get *good teaching* and to have a good learning atmosphere.
7. All people in a school have a right to *solve problems* that are bothering them.
8. All people have a right to *fair hearing* before being criticized or punished for wrong-doing.
9. All people have a *right to try to change rules* that affect them.
10. All people have a *right to expect authorities* to protect *these rights*.

The authors have been a little hasty when they advise that "the soundest way for a board to insure substantive due process is to adopt clear codes prohibiting serious student misconduct." While such codes, if well written, can be a part of due process procedures, they are merely a rule book and can do little to insure due process for students. Due process that permeates interpersonal relationships in the school, is based upon trust in one another and in rational processes, sincerely presumes that people at least **think** they have good reason for doing what they do, permits mistakes, and assumes every person is innocent until proven guilty is the best insurance against serious misbehavior.

The Ohio School Boards Association booklet, *Student Due Process: What You Need to Know and Do*, also presents useful information, sound advice, and suggestions that could help to create positive and fair school policies. The checklist on due process and the list of sources for information about school codes and disciplinary policies are useful.

Some boards could develop cold and inflexible policies that would harm the educational process unless they adhere to the spirit of due process as a pervasive principle of interpersonal relations rather than a more legal imposition upon school authority. The booklet quietly suggests such positive approaches, but is not as explicit as might be useful for some boards.

# EXCLUSION: TEACHING BY REMOTE CONTROL

School suspension is one of the most controversial approaches to school discipline. The effectiveness of exclusion as a technique for encouraging good discipline is highly questionable, however, school officials have had almost unlimited authority to send students home. Even where legal procedures were required by law or school board policy or both, those requirements were ignored or treated lightly.

For the most part, the public and many school personnel believe that suspensions are administered only in severe cases. Suspension often is defended as the only way to protect teachers and other students from danger or disruption. Recent court cases and careful study, however, do not support those perceptions.

First, suspension is widely used. The Childrens' Defense Fund (CDF) study of suspension rates in 2,862 districts enrolling about half the students in the United States indicates that in 1972-73 more than one million children (out of 24 million enrolled) were suspended from school for an average of just over four days per child. Similarly, in a review of a sample of Ohio schools reporting to the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) for the 1973-74 school year, one out of ten junior and senior high school students were suspended at least once.

The use of suspensions in public schools is frequent, but few suspensions are for dangerous or disruptive behavior. According to the CDF's publication, *School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children?*, the 300 school officials and community leaders, and the 6,500 families surveyed for the report indicated that the vast majority of school suspensions were for non-dangerous, non-violent offenses. Nearly one-fourth of all supsensions were for truancy and tardiness. About one-third of the suspensions were for fighting; but only .01 percent were for fights involving school personnel. Less than three percent of the suspensions were for destruction of property, the use of alcohol or drugs, or other criminal activity. The remaining third of the offenses involved smoking, pregnancy, violations of dress codes, or failure to purchase required equipment.

A third important finding is that more white children than others are suspended but greater **proportions** of black, poor, male and older students are suspended. During the 1972-73 year, the CDF's review of OCR data indicated that black students were suspended at twice the rate of any other group (11.8 percent compared to 6.0 percent for white secondary students). Evidence does not support that black students are more disruptive. Similarly, in a sample of school districts in Ohio, of the white students studied, 9 percent were suspended compared to 19 percent of the black students who were studied. This finding indicates that there are many ways in which suspensions may be misused.

If discipline is to be fairly administered, due process must govern suspensions and other ways of excluding students. The *Goss v. Lopez* decision made Section 3313.66 of the Ohio Revised Code unconstitutional. In order to protect students from unfair exclusion from school and conform with the Supreme Court decision, the Ohio General Assembly and many other states have adopted new legislation. Major provisions of the Ohio legislation are discussed below.

**Discipline Code:**

By September 1, 1976, each board of education had to adopt a code of student conduct stating the types of misconduct for which a student may be suspended or expelled. The code must be in writing, a copy must be posted in a central location so people may read it, and copies must be made available to students upon request. All actions to suspend or expel must be in accord with the code.

**Suspensions:**

A student may be suspended up to ten school days for any conduct which is not approved by the superintendent or the principal. **Before** the suspension, school officials must give the student*

a. written notice stating their intention to suspend and giving reasons for the suspension.

b. an opportunity to appear at an informal hearing before the principal, the superintendent or someone the superintendent appoints to challenge the reasons for the suspension or to explain his or her conduct.*

**Expulsion:**

Only the superintendent may expel a student and then only until the end of the current semester. Before the expulsion, the student and his or her parent, guardian or custodian must be given written notice stating that the superintendent intends to expel the student and including

a. the reasons for expulsion,

b. notification of the opportunity for the student, and the parents, guardian, custodian or representative to appear before the superintendent or someone designated by the superintendent to challenge reasons or to explain the student's behavior; and

c. notice of the time and place of the hearing, which has to be held no earlier than three nor later than five days after notice is given.

The student, parent, guardian, custodian or representative may request a later date for the hearing, and the superintendent may grant the request but must notify them in writing of the new date, time, and place for the hearing.

After the hearing, if the student is expelled, the superintendent must, within 24 hours, inform the student's parent, guardian, or custodian in writing that the student is expelled and tell them (a) that they may appeal the expulsion to the board of education or to someone that the board has designated; (b) that they have a right to be represented in the appeal, and that they may request a private (executive) session for the appeal. If the student, parent, guardian or custodian requests a hearing, the board of education may appoint some school official or other individual to hear the appeal. It may be done in private if the student, parent, guardian or custodian requests, but the decision must be made in a public session, and a verbatim record must be made. The board's hearing officer may uphold the expulsion, reinstate the student to school, or in any other way reverse, drop the case, or change the original expulsion. If the student or his or her parent or representative does not agree with the outcome of the hearing, he or she may appeal to the Court of Common Pleas as provided in Chapter 2506 of the

*The Goss decision also provides that the student is entitled to an explanation of evidence supporting the reasons, though the Code does not.

Revised Code (Appeals from Orders of Administrative Officers and Agencies).

**Removal:**

If the principal or superintendent feels that the student poses a continuing danger to other people or to property, or if there is an ongoing threat of disrupting the academic process in the classroom, in extracurricular activities or on the school premises, the student may be removed from those premises without a notice or hearing. Teachers may remove such a student from the classroom or extracurricular activity, but they have to submit a written report to the principal as soon as practicable.

Within 72 hours after such removal a hearing must be held under the same rules that apply to a suspension or an expulsion, whichever seems most likely to be the consequence of the removal. The person ordering the removal must be present at the hearing, and the student must be given written notice of the hearing and the reasons for removal prior to the hearing. The student may be reinstated, but if the teacher asks, the hearing officer must provide a written explanation why the student is being returned to class.

No notice or hearing is necessary if the student is removed from classes or extracurricular activities (but not the school grounds) for a period of less than twenty-four hours.

## ALTERNATIVE DISCIPLINARY TECHNIQUES

Ineffective disciplinary techniques are often used because, as disciplinarians explain, "I didn't know what else to do." Many bad practices are used only because they have always been used and they have become habits. Some are almost synonymous with schooling: generations have sung about teaching "to the tune of a hickory stick," and if any child from nearly any school area is asked to play teacher, he or she will take up a ruler and threaten to "paddle" you if you "don't behave." Many teachers and administrators feel defenseless if they cannot paddle or suspend students. However, many teachers and administrators **never** paddle, and many schools—even in the toughest areas—seldom, if ever, suspend. Their experience proves that effective alternatives do exist.

No technique or procedure can overcome the inability, misunderstanding, or malice of the people who exercise it. There is no technique—no matter how elegant—that can't be made totally ineffective or even destructive by personnel who do not know how or who do not intend to make it work.

Although every person in the school system plays a part in teaching effective discipline or in undermining it, observers generally agree that the school principal plays the most important role. Journalist William Raspberry observed that he would not advise parents to learn the names of effective principals in order to interview them or to visit their schools to learn about good programs because the only effective way to make use of such principals was to hire them away from their schools to work in yours. His observation has been born out by much research on schools and school principals. A competent principal does not make up for inadequacies or negative attitudes of staff members, incompetence or malpractice of the central office and board policies, or ignorance and negative politics of a community; however, able and vigorous leadership can often overcome such effects and is absolutely essential for successful disciplinary and instructional practices to succeed in local schools.

Research clearly indicates that the appointment of a new principal is a crucial point in the life of a school. Neither school authorities, teachers, nor parents should take the choice so lightly as current practices do in most school systems. It is extremely difficult and virtually impossible for the school board, the superintendent, the teachers in the building, or the parents in the community to overcome the ill effects of a poor school principal, unless teachers and others play an active role and take responsibility for what occurs in schools, and superintendents recognize that their most important contribution to a school program may be the appointment of a principal.

Another valuable resource for teaching self-discipline is a faculty who can engage in responsible action to solve problems. They must be able to relate to other adults and students with self-confidence and without the need to impose their own neuroses or blame their own problems on others. When the student is behaving childishly, the teacher's ability to maintain poise and to act as a stabilizer can translate potential conflict into a learning experience. Teachers who are self-assured, who can accept their own weaknesses, who do not have to pick up every challenge from a child, who don't need to prove their authority are living examples of self-discipline for students. Teachers who are not governed by fear, threat, need for status, undue awe for authority figures, or the need to be perfect are the backbone of any effective disciplinary program. Those who bring enthusiasm, respect for individuals, faith in themselves and in the students, willingness to try untried practices, and a sense of humor to the classroom and the faculty meeting are walking curricula who simultaneously convey and command the self-respect essential for self-discipline. Just as every student is capable of self-control, every teacher is capable of becoming a person who fits the models discussed in this paragraph—if the school structure and climate supports and promotes their doing so.

Appendix A presents nearly 50 alternative disciplinary techniques for improving discipline which fall in seven major categories: punishment and control; treatment of student needs; interactive strategies to bring the student and school worlds closer; supportive human resources to help teachers and students; teacher skills improvement; improved rules; and alternative educational settings. Each alternative has advantages and disadvantages and trade offs must be made between the positive and negative in each case. Some school staffs will be able to maximize the positive outcomes, while others may be unable to do so. Despite the multiplicity of factors influencing the success of any teaching method—and in reality, every disciplinary technique is intended to teach a student new behavior—the table should be helpful to people who want to find alternative ways to provide discipline in their schools.

School personnel and community members often go to other communities or schools for advice on policies and procedures that seem to be effective. Selected programs that have reported success in reducing problems and improving discipline in school are described in Appendix B.

Much can be learned from sharing such information—even if it only proves that good schools and effective practices in local schools requires more than just adopting a policy or procedures. Successful programs for teaching discipline depend upon unique interactions among individuals more than on policies, procedures, theories, or purposes. When borrowing a technique or practice from someone else, it is always wise to adapt it to local conditions. Furthermore, school personnel must be able to act upon the spirit more than the letter of the borrowed policy. A failure to borrow with caution can harm the efforts of those who are doing exceptionally well in teaching self-discipline.

Before adopting any exemplary programs from other places, both citizens and school personnel should be aware of some of the limitations of such programs:

1. Exemplary programs may not be what they are publicized to be. Sometimes the events described are not actually occurring in the school but are merely someone's imagination or dreams. Often the program is made successful by factors that are not included in any of the descriptions of the program. In addition, programs described may have built-in problems that have been overcome by participants but are not included in the program descriptions.
2. All programs and techniques have disadvantages as well as advantages. Any tendency to look for perfection can cause people to overlook positive features, and will prevent developing any program.
3. Model programs may not be in 1978 what they were in 1972; so they may be unnecessarily rejected because of what has happened to make them less effective. Money may have been taken away; key figures such as a particular principal, teacher, aide, volunteer or student may no longer be in the program; the problems the program addressed in 1972 may be out of fashion; or other persons or programs may now be doing what the program was designed to do, so it is no longer needed.
4. We cannot always rely upon the opinions of other educators (or other observers) to give any evidence about the utility of a model program. The reporter may like an activity even though it destroys effective learning or may not like a program that is quite valuable.

## CONCLUSION

Though concerns about school discipline are often exaggerated, a perceived lack of discipline has posed educational problems for centuries and continues to vex educators and lay citizens alike. Similarly, the solutions have been successfully applied in homes and schools for centuries. Discipline is an educational goal, best achieved when school staffs or parents (or both) take on the task for teaching desired behaviors rather than expending resources in vain attempts to impose external controls.

In American schools, disciplinary methods should be compatible with basic American principles. Methods that violate those principles or that have totalitarian side effects should be abandoned in favor of methods that encourage responsible, self-disciplined exercise of essential rights and freedoms by every member of the school. Viewed from such perspectives, discipline problems may be seen as unique opportunities to teach essential principles for social responsibility. Recent court decisions and legislative mandates lay groundwork for such teaching. School officials must recognize that disruptive behaviors are often caused by forces created in the way schools are operated. By understanding that fact, many schools have reduced disruptive incidents and created effective climates for teaching self-discipline by enabling school staff members to engage in problem-solving relationships which foster more educational interactions with students and with parents. Relationships that produce self-discipline are hallmarks of a quality education program and the foundation for a free society.

## SOURCES


Alschuler, Alfred, *et al.*
*A Primer for Social Literacy Training: Liberating Approaches To The Discipline Problem*
Social Literacy Project
456 Hills South
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01002

*Alternatives to Suspension*
American Friends Service Commission
Chicago Public Education Project
Midwest Regional Office
407 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60605 (Price: FREE)

*Children Out of School in America*
Children's Defense Fund
1746 Cambridge Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Coates, T. J. and C. E. Thorson
"Teacher Anxiety: A Review with Recommendations," *Review of Education Research*, Vol. 46: 159-184, 1976.

*Discipline Crisis in Schools: The Problem, Causes and Search for Solutions*, 1973
National School Public Relations Association
18101 N. Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209 Price $4.75

Egerton, John
*School Desegregation: A Report Card From The South*
April, 1976
Southern Regional Council
52 Fairlie Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30303 Price $4.00

Forehand, Garlie A. and Marjorie Ragosta
*A Handbook for Integrated Schooling*
July, 1976
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

*Inequality in Education: Discipline and Student Rights, #20*, July, 1975
Center for Law and Education
Harvard University, Larsen Hall
14 Appian Way
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

*School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children?*
Children's Defense Fund
1746 Cambridge Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship
American Bar Association
(Bibliography on Law-Related Curricula)
1155 E. 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Weinberg, Meyer
*Minority Students: A Research Appraisal* March, 1977
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
National Institute of Education
Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, Senator Birch Bayh, Chairman
*Our Nation's Schools—A Report Card: "A" in School Violance and Vandalism*, 1975
*Challenge for the Third Century: Education in a Safe Environment—Final Report on the Nature and Prevention of School Violence and Vandalism*, 1977
Available from Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

## RESOURCE PEOPLE

The reader should consult the *preceding catalog* in addition to the names listed below. Each of these people should be able to recommend other competent persons.

John Bates
Coordinator of Inner City Programs, Toronto Board of Education, 53 Spruce, Aurora, Ontario M4V 1R9. 416-727-6567.

Rayalene Brizendine
Coordinator of Field Experience and Personnel Development, South-Western City School District, 2817 Highland St., Grove City, Ohio 43123. 614-875-2115.

James J. Buffer
Former principal, Cleveland Ohio. Professor, College of Education, The Ohio State University, Room 200, Welding Engineering, 190 W. 19th Ave., Columbus, Ohio. 614-422-7471.

David G. Carter
(former principal, Dayton, Ohio), Associate Professor, College of Education, Rackley Building, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania. 814-865-1487.

Central Ohio School Study Council
29 W. Woodruff Ave., Columbus, Ohio 43210. 614-422-7702.

Delores Diggs
Research Associate, College of Education, The Ohio State University, 250 Sherbourne Dr.. Columbus, Ohio 43219. 614-252-4463.

William Eyman
Former Director, Perth Amboy Alternate High School. Educational Consultant, 421 Buffington Rd., Syracuse, New York 13224. 315-446-8169.

Catherine Feike
Principal, Douglas Alternative School, 55 South Douglas St., Columbus, Ohio 43205. 614-252-1166.

Dudley F. Flood
Assistant State Superintendent for Human Relations and Student Affairs, North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina 27611.

Robert Green
Assistant Professor, Education, Capital University, 2199 E. Main St., Columbus, Ohio 43209. 614-236-6301.

Phyllis Greer
Consultant—Staff Development, 1200 Harvard Blvd., Dayton, Ohio 45406.

Lee Hall
Teacher, Gladstone Elementary School, Columbus, Ohio, 5200 Shannon Road, Canal Winchester, Ohio 43110. 614-837-1102.

Thomas Hayden
Coordinator of Community Education, Ohio Department of Education, Room 802—Ohio Departments Building, 65 South Front St., Columbus, Ohio 43215. 614-466-3641.

William Heward
Assistant Professor, College of Education, The Ohio State University, 356 Arps Hall, Columbus, Ohio 43210. 614-422-8787.

Jeanne Huelsman
Counselor, 2119 Algonquin Rd., Euclid, Ohio 44117. 216-481-0025.

George Kahdy
Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of North Carolina, Raleigh, North Carolina 27611.

Thomas Lasley
Consultant, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, Ohio State Department of Education, 65 S. Front Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

Sidney Mann
(former vice-principal and Title III administrator), Registrar, Elmira College, Elmira, New York 14902. 607-734-3911.

"Pops" Miller
Principal, East Mecklenburg High School, Charlotte - Mecklenburg School District, 6800 Monroe Road, Charlotte, North Carolina 28216.

Marilyn Parker
Reading Teacher, Columbus Public Schools, 2675 Andover Road, Columbus, Ohio 43221. 614-486-5552.

Robert Parker
Department of Continuing Education, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey 08550. 609-921-9000.

Gay S. Pinnell
Consultant, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, Ohio State Department of Education, 65 S. Front Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215. 614-466-3106.

Charles Rivers
(former Director of Dropout Prevention Program, Dayton, Ohio), Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, Chapel Hill-Carrboro Public Schools, Lincoln Center, Merritt Mill Rd., Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514. 919-967-8211.

Russell J. Spillman
Assistant Dean, College of Education, The Ohio State University, 310 Ramseyer Hall, Columbus, Ohio 43210. 614-422-7700.

Susan Sears
Former Director of Career Education, Scioto-Darby Schools, 42 Scenic Road, Blacklick, Ohio 43004. 614-861-4557.

Bunny Shontz
Music Teacher, Columbus Public Schools, 195 W. California Ave., Columbus, Ohio 43202. 614-263-3907.

Jean Smith
Coordinator of Field Experiences, Scioto-Darby Schools, 3859 Main St., Hilliard, Ohio 43026. 614-876-4106.

Thomas M. Stephens
Professor, College of Education, The Ohio State University, 371 Arps Hall, Columbus, Ohio 43210. 614-422-8787.

Linda Thompson
Teacher, Columbus City Schools, 5107 Sansom Ct., Columbus, Ohio 43220. 614-451-3214.

Jean Tippett
Coordinator of Field Experiences, Whitehall City Schools, 4311 Kumler Drive, Whitehall, Ohio 43213. 614-235-1261.

William W. Wayson
Professor, College of Education, The Ohio State University, 236 Ramseyer Hall, Columbus, Ohio 43210. 614-422-4874.

# APPENDIX A

## Approaches for Improving School Discipline

*Copyright, by William W. Wayson, 1977. Permission granted to Citizens Council for Ohio Schools to use for nonprofit purposes.*

### I. Punishment and Control — Techniques which utilize the authority of the school to control students.

| Approach | Definition | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|---|---|---|---|
| Corporal punishment | The student is physically punished in some way (paddling, pinching, shaking, slapping, "swatting," smacking hands, etc.). | Immediate and concrete punishment is applied.<br>Corporal punishment may be the only method some students respect. (Doubtful)<br>Can clear the air and terminate the event. | Often used as outlet for adult frustration.<br>May not be effective in changing behavior in desired direction.<br>Students often do not understand the reason for punishment.<br>Teaches that "might makes right" rather than the solving of problems.<br>Violence is antiethical to the educational process and human dignity.<br>Legal implications may make it impractical.<br>Often unfairly administered to innocent parties.<br>Often disproportionately administered to minority and poor students.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems. |
| Expulsion | Student must leave school for more than 10 days.<br>May not be applied without<br>• written notice to parent<br>• written reasons,<br>• notification of opportunity for hearing,<br>• notification of time and place for hearing. | Gets the disruptive student out of the school.<br>Can improve group behavior by removing the "troublemaker". (Doubtful in most cases).<br>Removes disruptive elements before they spread. (Doubtful in most cases). | Forces out students rather than dealing with the problem.<br>Effects are the same as suspension except more severe.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems. |
| Suspension or variations such as sending home or extended "cooling off" | Student must leave school for a designated period of time. (Ohio law stipulates up to 10 school days). May not be applied without<br>• written notice prior to suspension,<br>• written statement of reasons,<br>• opportunity for informal hearing. | Gets the disruptive student out of the classroom and school.<br>The disruptive student cannot disturb others.<br>May get parents to come to school for a conference. (Generally poor method for doing so). | Can teach that power is absolute and arbitrary.<br>Without due process, teaches students a sense of helplessness.<br>Has little positive educational value.<br>Gives students official approval to be out of school.<br>Encourages school officials to deny responsibility.<br>Often disproportionately applied to minority groups.<br>Students are denied education; time is not used productively.<br>May put student irreparably behind in school work.<br>Does not rehabilitate the student; does not get to the source of the problem; denies treatment.<br>Often used for trivial or non-disruptive purposes.<br>Gives students a "record"; often leads to repeated suspensions.<br>In many cases, no parent conference is held.<br>Often alienates students and parents.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems. |

| Approach | Definition | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|---|---|---|---|
| Security forces and precautions | Security officers are on duty in the school. Security aides such as locks and bars on windows are utilized. A promising variation is to have a person or a family live on school premises to discourage burglary or after-hours vandalism. | Security personnel can prevent vandalism.<br>Security personnel sometimes deter potential discipline problems.<br>Makes teachers feel more secure.<br>Security personnel sometimes take personal interest in students.<br>Security can save equipment, etc., from theft. | Often exacerbates problems, requires increasing effort.<br>Can reinforce idea that students "don't belong".<br>Security forces and equipment are expensive.<br>Sets up a prison-like atmosphere in which students have little chance of developing self-discipline.<br>Indicates fear and distrust on the part of school officials.<br>May "turn off" staff, students, parents, and community.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems. |
| Detention | Student spends extra hours in the school or classroom as punishment. | Is a non-violent form of punishment, usually applied the same day.<br>Students can put the time to use by doing homework.<br>Students involved in extracurricular activities have extra incentive to avoid detention. | Staff can see monitoring as noneducational imposition.<br>Often given for trivial offenses.<br>Hours of detention can be a status symbol among peer groups.<br>The detention room can be a dumping ground; students often are not engaged in productive work.<br>School is lengthened as a punishment, implying that school is punishment.<br>Sometimes whole classes are forced to stay as a result of a few students' misbehavior. (Very poor educational practice).<br>Too many detentions given willynilly destroys effectiveness.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems.<br>Requires special process for transported students. |
| Sending students to principal's office | The student is told to go to the principal's office to be disciplined by the principal. | Teacher can immediately remove a disruptive student.<br>Teacher is relieved of pressure and responsibility.<br>Principal is informed of problems. | Principal's office is often filled with students.<br>Principal's role is defined as disciplinarian and punisher.<br>Children may learn that teachers can't discipline.<br>Principal has no time for creative administration.<br>Time is taken away from learning activities.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems. |
| Transfers | A student who is not working well in a particular classroom or school is transferred to another situation. | A transfer can resolve personality conflicts.<br>A student can be placed in a situation where teaching methods better suit his/her learning style.<br>Student is in a learning situation rather than being suspended or expelled.<br>Student can exercise choice, take responsibility for own program. | Transfers may be used as punishment.<br>Receiving schools may resent or reject new students.<br>Records may label the student in a negative way.<br>Student can be moved around just to get rid of problems rather than trying to solve them.<br>Some "voluntary" transfers are really force-outs.<br>Often used as a step prior to expulsion with little help for the student.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems. |
| Loss of privileges | Students who misbehave lose privileges such as assembly, gym, etc. Some systems have a demerit system which results in loss of privileges. | If students want to retain privileges, they are motivated to behave appropriately. | If privileges are not seen as important, the technique will not work.<br>Students may misbehave to get out of some extra-curricular activities.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems.<br>Special teachers resent loss of student time. |

| Approach | Definition | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|---|---|---|---|
| In-house suspension | The student is suspended but stays at school, usually restricted to a certain area such as a study hall or room. | Student is removed from immediate situation.<br>Student can receive counseling and work towards rehabilitation.<br>Parents are pleased that the school is dealing with the problem rather than sending the student home.<br>Suspension and expulsion are reduced.<br>School is not denied to the student.<br>Time can be used productively.<br>Can develop personal relationship between the student and some staff member. | Often such programs are highly regimented.<br>If student is too restricted, experience can build up further dislike for school.<br>Time may not be used productively if proper help is not available.<br>Is expensive in terms of supervision.<br>Students who behave well in the suspension room could often behave well back in the classroom.<br>Students may misbehave again to escape the boredom.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems. |
| Physical exercise (Doing "laps") | Students who fight or otherwise misbehave engage in physical exercise such as running, doing push-ups, etc. | Excess energy is worked off.<br>Students are distracted from original misbehavior.<br>Permits students to cool-off, regain composure. | Making students tired may in some cases increase the problem.<br>Students may learn that exercise is a punishment rather than a need of the body.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems.<br>Can be excessive and cruel. |
| "Fresh air class" | Students who are disruptive spend time in activities as cleaning up the school grounds. | Energies are channeled into productive activities.<br>Needed work is done.<br>Student may gain stature for doing important work. | Students may learn that keeping grounds neat is a punishment rather than a duty as a citizen.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems. |
| **II. Treatment of Individual Student Needs:** | **Techniques which attempt to fulfill or counteract perceived deficiencies within individual students.** | | |
| Drugs | The student is given tranquilizers or stimulants to modify behavior by increasing attention span or calming activity. | Can be helpful in a small percentage of cases who have been accurately and carefully diagnosed by a physician. | Represents a radical intervention in the student's life.<br>Often misused by being given indescriminately.<br>Are sometimes administered to students who are exhibiting normal behavior in response to rigid teacher expectations.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems. |
| Dietary modifications | A change in diet to reduce the intake of certain foods whose chemical content can produce (or is associated with) undesirable behaviors<br>or<br>to increase the intake of certain nutritional elements whose lack is associated with undesirable behaviors. | Works well for students whose behavior is related to dietary intake.<br>Can prevent student from being labeled a "learning disability."<br>Can provide "answer" for otherwise unexplainable behavior.<br>May be substituted for ill-advised drug treatment.<br>Little chance of harming child. | Doesn't work with all children.<br>Can be overused by faddists.<br>Probably should be used after a good medical examination.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems (unless school food has wrong nutritional balance for student). |
| Special education classes | Students who are having discipline problems are referred to special education professionals for diagnosis and prescription. Sometimes students are put into special classes for "emotionally handicapped or disabled." | Students get professional treatment.<br>Teachers have resources; can get expert advice.<br>Teacher does not have to cope with the disruptive student. | Often used discriminatorily against minority students.<br>Isolates problem students; prevents normal school life.<br>Assumes disruptions are caused by problem students rather than normal frustrations.<br>Stigma attached to special classes.<br>Used instead of suspension or expulsion to avoid due process requirements.<br>Often labels student for entire school career.<br>Tendency to lump together for treatment those who have special problems and those who don't.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems. |

| Approach | Definition | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|---|---|---|---|
| Positive reinforcement (Also called behavior modification, response shaping, success approximation, or contingency management). | The goal is to reward appropriate behavior and not reward those that are not desirable. The technique is built on the theory that we tend to repeat behaviors we find rewarding. | Negative actions and punishment are eliminated. Inappropriate behavior is simply ignored while appropriate behavior is rewarded by praise or other means.<br>The approach is especially effective when the positive reinforcement is inherent in the consequences of appropriate behavior (such as involvement in work or constructive interaction with other students).<br>Helps teachers understand learning better.<br>Can build emphasis upon the positive throughout the school.<br>Gives teachers an effective tool they can use without additional resources.<br>Helps teachers describe behavior better. | Positive reinforcement is sometimes accomplished by external means only.<br>Can fail to build on intrinsic drives and rewards.<br>When misused, behavior modification programs can destroy initiative and self determination.<br>Some people fear "mind control" over unwitting students.<br>Program can be rigid, inflexible and dull.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems. |
| Specialized help for children with special needs | The teacher refers children with suspected physical problems or severe emotional problems to outside resource persons such as psychologists, nurses, therapists, counselors. | Sometimes discipline problems are the result of neglected or unsuspected medical problems. When such problems are relieved, disruptive behavior ceases.<br>Sometimes children's emotional problems or home situations are so severe that professional help is needed.<br>The teacher is relieved of sole responsibility for the student's problems.<br>Consultative help is available to the teacher. | Qualified specialized help is not always available.<br>When resource persons are available, they may not have enough time to devote to individual students.<br>Sometimes professional resource persons diagnose but do little to help the teacher deal with the problems.<br>The danger of "labeling" the child as a learning or emotionally disabled student should be avoided.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems. |
| Meeting basic needs | The school provides for basic needs which may be missing in the student's life. An example is the breakfast program provided in many city schools or the provision of warm clothing.<br>Also could include programs to provide personal support, "buddies", parent-figures, etc.<br>Could also include activities to help student feel safe and a valued member of the group. | Some of the barriers to learning and involvement are removed.<br>If students lack enough food or warm clothing, they find it difficult to concentrate on school work.<br>Can make student feel secure, valued.<br>Can promote relationship between student and school personnel.<br>Can provide "linkage" with the complex, unresponsive organization. | Extra time is needed to find out about a student's needs and to make provision for them.<br>Money is needed to institute programs such as free hot lunches.<br>Sometimes help is given to children in such a way as to destroy dignity.<br>Staff often resents such activities as "not part of learning."<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems. |
| **III. Interactive Strategies:** **Techniques which bring the student's world and the school world together.** | | | |
| Behavior contracts | A contract is made between the student and the principal or teacher to achieve stated objectives. The contract may be sent to parents. | Can develop personal relationships between student and staff.<br>If worked out cooperatively, the contract puts responsibility on the student to meet his/her own agreements.<br>Parents know what is expected.<br>Expectations are clear.<br>The "official" nature of the contract impresses the student with its seriousness.<br>May be used to address school causes for problems.<br>No extra funding is required. | Extra staff time is needed to make and follow up on the contract.<br>If imposed by authorities, all advantages can be negated.<br>May not address school causes for problems. |
| Appeal boards or ombudspersons | Appeal boards or ombudspersons constitute a third party to which students can appeal if they feel they have been unfairly treated by school officials. Student ombudspersons may be utilized. | An objective opinion is available.<br>Students learn from the proceedings.<br>Students do not feel helpless in the face of school authority.<br>Some boards are composed of students and community people as well as school people. | Boards take time and effort to organize.<br>Boards and ombudspersons may require extra money.<br>Careful planning is required so that the system will actually work.<br>See "Advocacy." |

| Approach | Definition | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|---|---|---|---|
| Community involvement in discipline problems | Schools make contact with community agencies which serve as a link with the home. | Community agencies are able to provide resources and make contracts that school people cannot.<br>Agency can serve in a consultative capacity to the teacher.<br>Agencies offer training courses for parents and students and provide counseling services. | Extra time is involved in seeking community involvement.<br>Often not as effective as direct communication with the student's parents.<br>Community agencies may operate under a philosophy which is detrimental to what the teacher is trying to do.<br>May not address school causes for problems. |
| Community Schools<br>Mott Program<br>Flint Program<br>or other variants of community involvements in the school.<br>Adult education and recreation programs<br>Volunteer or paraprofessional staffing plans | Any practice which involves parents and other citizens in the school as active participants, either as recipients of services, as staff adjuncts, or in problem solving roles. Any practice which makes the school an integral part of community life for persons normally not in school as well as students. Degree of mutual involvement varies widely. | Generally, the more integral the school in community life, the fewer discipline problems will be.<br>Makes it easier to settle discipline problems by focusing more school, home, and community resources.<br>Reduces community opposition to measures taken and support for disrupters.<br>Gives students sense of ownership; greater sense of value and responsibility.<br>Reduces barriers between school/community.<br>Raises respect for and confidence in school personnel.<br>Increases staff self-confidence.<br>Nips problems in the bud.<br>Increases communication and problem-solving.<br>Can address school causes for problems.<br>Reduces cultural barriers, staff fears.<br>Reduces mutual prejudices.<br>Can reduce vandalism.<br>Can improve staff performance.<br>Makes effective use of space freed by lower enrollments.<br>Can facilitate relationships with other agencies involved in educational/recreational services.<br>Makes efficient use of space and people at "down times."<br>Can provide additional employment for staff members.<br>Brings all ages together in school. | Takes time, maybe space and personnel.<br>School personnel may resent feedback.<br>School personnel may fear parental involvement.<br>Sharing space may produce friction.<br>School personnel may dominate groups.<br>Teachers' unions, custodians, or administrators may resist some forms of involvement.<br>Working out working relationships requires a "shakedown" period.<br>Persons or groups currently benefitting from present school practices may oppose new groups' involvement.<br>Can cause staff members to leave (may be an advantage in some cases).<br>Teachers need inservice to develop human relations skills and attitudes (can be advantage to improving total school program).<br>May be inadequately conceptualized or implemented. |
| Advocacy Programs<br>(one variant is ombudsperson) | Each student selects one teacher or administrator to act as an advisor and mediator in the event that he/she has problems<br>or<br>specified members of staff are designated advocate<br>or<br>whole school is trained to protect the rights of others<br>or<br>whole staff acts on behalf of students in preference to other considerations. | Student is able to deal with an adult whom he/she trusts.<br>Provides checks and balances against inappropriate actions.<br>Relationships are built between students and teachers.<br>Possibilities are opened up for ongoing personal counseling.<br>Parents gain confidence that staff works for students.<br>Addresses many school causes for problems.<br>Assures students they are valued. | Mechanism may not allow for changes if relationships fail to achieve purposes.<br>Program must be voluntary on both sides.<br>Students who are in a failure pattern may find it difficult to establish relationship with any school person.<br>Staff may shift responsibility to one or a few persons.<br>Staff (and administratio) may resent advocates. |

27

28

| Approach | Definition | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|---|---|---|---|
| Home visits | Teachers make friendly non-evaluative visits to the students' homes, preferably during the first few months of school. Both friendly and problem-solving visits are made throughout the school year. | Commumnity gains respect for school staff.<br>Students learn that teachers are interested and that their homes are worthwhile places for teachers to visit.<br>Relationships are established with parents before evaluation creates tension.<br>Students know that the teacher has direct contact with the home; therefore, "game playing" and disruptive behavior are lessened.<br>Student self-esteem is increased.<br>The teacher knows the student better.<br>Teacher loses prejudices about parents and vice-versa.<br>Teacher gains confidence. | Sometimes teachers are shy or apprehensive about making home visits. Going in pairs for the first few visits is helpful.<br>Home visits take time.<br>Teacher unions may oppose them.<br>Instructional value isn't recognized.<br>Teachers may go to "study" homes.<br>Teachers may go only to "tattle" to parent.<br>Other teachers resent home visitors. |
| Parent involvement (various forms) | Parents volunteer in schools or classrooms. Parents are involved and informed about the school situation. If behavior contracts are formed, parents are part of the arrangement. Teachers invite parents into the school for a variety of reasons rather than for discipline or evaluation only. Teachers visit students' homes. | Communication between the home and school gives the student added security and helps in making expectations clear.<br>Added parent contact builds trust on the part of students and parents.<br>Students cannot easily play "games" between home and school.<br>Parents react positively to increased contact. | Sometimes difficult to get parents involved, especially if they work long hours and have economic difficulties.<br>Teachers must be careful not to be judgmental, constantly evaluating or talking about disruptive behavior.<br>Time is needed to build positive teacher/parent relationships. |
| Teacher/ student conference | The teacher and student talk together about the violations of rules or discipline problems. | Communication is established on a one-to one basis; involves student in solving own problems.<br>Both get a chance to talk and to listen to each other; helps get at causes.<br>Student is not given a lecture before peers; can save face; gives student sense of being valued. | Is sometimes not sufficient as a deterrent to misbehavior.<br>An in-depth discussion, especially with a student who has severe problems, takes time and skill.<br>Can turn into a "lecture." |
| Class meetings and discussion<br>Rap sessions | Class meets as a group to solve problems, to discuss causes of behavior, to specify what behavior is desirable, to improve classroom routines. | Negative reactions are turned into positive interaction.<br>A positive classroom environment is established.<br>Opportunities for choices and decisions are created.<br>Social learning is enhanced.<br>Students have a chance to be heard, feel they belong and are valued.<br>Students have responsibility, learn self-discipline.<br>Students learn ways of interacting positively and working together to solve problems.<br>Can address school causes for problems. | May not yield immediate effects from one rap session.<br>Must be utilzied over a period of time.<br>Class time may be limited.<br>Teachers may not see such sessions as "teaching."<br>Staff may resent having students "talk up."<br>Teacher may dominate discussion.<br>Parents may not see the educational value. |
| Strength bombardment | People in the school begin to focus on the positive attributes each person brings to the school. | Overcomes low moral and negative climate.<br>Fosters creativity in teachers.<br>Raises self-esteem in teachers and students.<br>Fosters pride in the school.<br>Can life community spirit. | Personnel and students can "go through the motions" but still feel negative.<br>Many school practices depend upon negative evaluations; practices need to change.<br>Uninvolved parents may see it as permissiveness or cover-up of problems.<br>Educators may lack skills. |

29

30

| Approach | Definition | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|---|---|---|---|
| **IV. Support Systems:** | **Techniques which link human resources to help individuals.** | | |
| Proximity | The teacher lets the student work near him/her. | Nearness provides the security and sense of control some students need.<br>The student can receive attention at times when he/she is behaving appropriately. | Is effective only if the student is gradually moved towards independence and self discipline.<br>A teacher cannot always keep one student nearby.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems. |
| Peer counseling | Students work in groups, receive special training in problem-solving skills, understanding self and their environment, and leadership. Students become co-leaders for other groups of students. They talk and help each other work out problems. | Students, particularly adolescents, are more trusting and likely to discuss problems with peers.<br>Students learn problem-solving skills and working with others.<br>Supportive groups are developed to reinforce positive behavior.<br>Students develop leadership skills.<br>Builds on the fact that peers are the greatest influence on adolescents.<br>May address school-caused problems. | Peer group counseling requires skilled adult guidance.<br>Is most useful at the secondary level. |
| Adult teams to help students | Teachers, administrators, aides, volunteers (parents and others)—form teams to take students aside when disruptive, talk to them, counsel them, etc. | Student is prevented from becoming more and more disruptive.<br>Energy is channeled into problem solving.<br>Can develop personal relationship between student and staff.<br>Can address school causes for problems.<br>Can help student become self-disciplined. | Adults often need inservice training or some kind of special help to work effectively together.<br>Extra adult help may not be available.<br>Takes time.<br>If one-sided, advantages can be negated.<br>May not address school causes for problems. |
| Adult teams to relieve teachers | Teachers, administrators, aides, volunteers, etc. form teams to help a teacher solve problems. | Support is provided for teachers.<br>Personality clashes are relieved.<br>Teachers gain perspective.<br>Trains teachers to deal with own problems.<br>Builds confidence as teacher gains ability.<br>Can address school causes for problems.<br>Can give teacher a cooling-off time. | May reinforce teachers' biases.<br>Teachers are often unwilling to talk about their problems to other teachers.<br>Time for group discussion and planning between teachers may not be readily available.<br>Team may not treat teacher as a peer learner.<br>May alienate teachers, cause them to ignore or hide problems. |
| **V. Training Strategies:** | **Techniques which seek to improve discipline problems through increasing the knowledge and skills of the people involved.** | | |
| Case Study | Teacher or other person notices a student who is a source of discipline problems and observes the student, taking careful note of the situations that elicit inappropriate and appropriate behavior, and gathering the relevant information to determine causes of behavior problems and possible solutions. (Child could do a self study) | Teacher works toward discovering causes of behavior problems rather than simply reducing symptoms.<br>The teacher takes active interest in the student; such interest can deter inappropriate behavior.<br>Develops deeper insight into behavior.<br>Can address school causes for problems.<br>Postpones precipitate action. | May encourage amateur psychology or sociology.<br>May not address immediate problems.<br>Time consuming.<br>May treat child as a thing to be studied.<br>May focus too narrowly on child and miss external causes.<br>May reinforce bias that student is deficient.<br>May focus on trivia or irrelevant factors. |

| Approach | Definition | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|---|---|---|---|
| Courses for students in human relations and psychology | Students are provided courses which help them to understand themselves and others better. | Can teach self-discipline.<br>Students begin to understand the causes for their own behavior and can consciously work to make changes.<br>Students can begin to understand the behavior of others, including teachers, and can learn to deal with it in positive ways.<br>Courses can provide a vehicle for discussion of student behavior.<br>Courses provide an interesting educational alternative.<br>May address school causes for problems. | Often difficult to find money and resources for offering new courses.<br>A teacher who adds the course to his/her load will have to find time and money for training and preparation.<br>Can be treated too academically; doesn't get acted upon.<br>Instructors may not comprehend, or model the behavior that is taught.<br>May be offered only for "better" students. |
| Role-playing | Students take the role of another person in conflict situation.<br>They could also play the teacher's role.<br>The technique can be used by teachers to analyze students' problems in inservice sessions. | Increases individual or group sensitivity to underlying causes for behavior problems.<br>Increases ability to see from another person's perception.<br>Can address school causes for problems. | Students and teachers are often self conscious in role playing situations. People need to become accustomed to role playing and to discussing it.<br>Can be disturbing to participants; should be carefully used if issues are sensitive.<br>Can be seen as "plays and games." |
| Behavior chaining | Persons who have been involved in or have observed a situation of conflict make a flow chart or diagram which represents every action, statement, or feeling in sequence. Discussion and analysis accompanies diagraming. | Individuals are allowed to describe actions and their own feelings and perceptions.<br>People involved develop awareness that there are usually several different points of view in any one incident.<br>An incident is described in concrete form so that causes may more easily be inferred.<br>Individuals develop the skills of objective description before leaping to inferences or judgments. | Chaining and describing behavior are skills which take time to develop.<br>Process is time consuming and would not be practical for every discipline incident.<br>Educators often lack skill for accurate description; get frustrated. |
| Staff development. Inservice training for teachers, administrators, aides, custodians, or any other member of the staff. | Includes teaching skills necessary for creating a school environment which teaches self-discipline. Any attempt, formal or informal, to teach staff members new skills, attitudes, knowledge or functions. | Teaching self-discipline requires knowledge and skill which is seldom adequately developed during undergraduate work and isn't often reinforced in schools.<br>During inservice training sessions, teachers can learn to work together in problem-solving groups.<br>New teachers can profit from the experience of other teachers in the school.<br>The inservice session can provide a time when teachers share their problems and use each other as resources.<br>Skills developed during inservice sessions, such as communication skills or awareness of cultural diversity, can "spill over" into work in other areas of the curriculum.<br>Addresses school causes for problems. | Takes time and money. Sometimes difficult for school officials to recognize the value of such expenditures.<br>Often very poorly done.<br>Parents must be educated to realize the value of released time for teachers to engage in professional development.<br>If teachers are not involved in planning for inservice, they may not respond positively.<br>If all staff are not included, teachers may find their new ideas frustrated by misunderstandings with aides, principals, or custodians.<br>May reinforce every school cause for problems. |

| Approach | Definition | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|---|---|---|---|
| Social Literacy Training | Helping a group of teachers become aware of shared problems, identify how school rules or organization cause those problems, and work together to improve the system by changing roles, goals, rules, practices, policies and norms. | Improves morale.<br>Increases confidence in self.<br>Improves relationships among staff and with students.<br>Reduces bickering among staff and blaming other people.<br>Addresses school causes for problems.<br>Reduces unfair, unproductive practices.<br>Teaches staff and students to be responsible, to be self-disciplined.<br>Makes people feel valued.<br>Builds a sense of community; improves learning atmosphere.<br>Can have "spin-off" effects such as higher achievement of students and better instructional decisions on part of teachers.<br>Prepares better citizens, both teachers and students. | Takes time.<br>Seems too simple to some staff members.<br>Takes away scapegoats.<br>Will not work if the staff believes the students and their parents to be the only source of problems.<br>Resistance or lack of participation by a few staff members can sabotage the process.<br>Staff members with highly diverse philosophies will find the process difficult (but such a situation makes it even more necessary). |
| **VI. Rule Systems:** | **Techniques which attempt to improve discipline problems by improving the effectiveness of written rules and guidelines.** | | |
| Discipline codes | The school system develops a clearly stated discipline code. Some codes are jointly developed by students, teachers, administrators, and parents. Student rights may be included as well as school rules and procedures. | Development can be used to build a sense of community and agreed upon norms for everyone.<br>Codes which are cooperatively developed are more likely to be understood and supported.<br>Expectations are clearly stated so that they can be understood.<br>Consequences and procedures are outlined so that each student may be assured of equal or fair treatment.<br>A well-developed, fair code can build up trust on the part of students.<br>If a bill of rights is included, the code becomes a social contract and not merely a legal form. (see Bill of Rights)<br>Can address school causes for problems. | The code can be so inflexible that it does not provide for individual personalities or extenuating circumstances.<br>If discipline codes are implemented by administrators alone, they may not be supported.<br>Discipline codes must be updated often so that the people following them feel that they have been involved in the creation or interpretation of them.<br>Clearly stating expectations and rights is a difficult process.<br>Codes can lead to an emphasis on the form rather than the substance (letter rather than spirit) of the procedures.<br>Often focuses only on student's transgressions.<br>Often treats only procedural "rights" not substantive rights.<br>May not address faculty culpability. |
| Computerized records on student conduct | Teachers have computer cards listing violations of rules. At each infraction, the teacher sends a card to the computer center. The computer selects the appropriate letter and sends it to the parent. | The computer provides a record of disciplinary action.<br>Parents are informed promptly of rule violations. | May be too expensive for the few advantages.<br>Can be impersonal and sterile.<br>Circumstances of the violation cannot be adequately recorded by computer.<br>Provides only the teacher's view.<br>A phone call to parents for any serious offense is more prompt than going through the computer.<br>Lessens possibilities for communication and cooperative planning between teachers and parents.<br>Doesn't address school causes for problems. |
| Eliminate unnecesary or vague rules | The teacher decides what is and what is not a problem. Rules which are not necessary for facilitation of learning and which may actually cause distraction (such as asking permission every time a student needs to sharpen a pencil) are eliminated. | Students are freed from trivial, oppressive constraints.<br>Can free the teacher from some aspects of disciplinary role.<br>When fewer rules exist, students can follow those necessary rules that do exist more carefully.<br>A less rigid atmosphere causes less frustration and hostility.<br>There is no "fun" in breaking a rule that does not exist.<br>Frees staff for pressing educational duties.<br>Can address school causes for problems. | Individual teachers must decide what rules they consider necessary.<br>When making school rules or eliminating school rules, it may take some time for teachers to reach concensus on what rules are necesary.<br>Staff and some parents may see trivial rules as safeguards against anarchy. |

| Approach | Definition | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bill of Rights | Students and school staff work together to develop a Bill of Rights, a set of inviolable freedoms, for all people who work and learn in the school. | Teaches self-discipline.<br>Students learn from the process of developing the Bill of Rights.<br>The Bill of Rights helps students become involved in the governance process of the school and in preventing discipline problems.<br>Students work to keep each other from infringing on rights.<br>Reasons for rules are made more understandable.<br>Both teachers and students get rights protected.<br>Gives students a sense of being valued and responsible.<br>Addresses many school causes for problems. | An effective Bill of Rights takes time to develop.<br>A variety of people with differing perceptions and opinions must find agreement.<br>Teachers or principals may not like granting rights to students.<br>Teachers may not understand how to apply rights in schools.<br>Students have to be taught how a bill of rights is applied to their actions.<br>Deciding about rights violations takes time, requires due process. |
| **VII. Alternative Educational Settings:** | **Strategies which seek to improve discipline problems and help individuals by providing for student and parent choice.** | | |
| Quiet places | Corners, small rooms, or retreats are constructed where students can go to be by themselves without distraction or to "cool off." | Tension is relieved.<br>Student has a chance to calm down before talking about a problem.<br>Escalation of conflict is prevented.<br>No punishment need be involved.<br>Can promote self disciplined behavior. | Teacher may overuse.<br>The "quiet place" may become an "isolation booth" for punishment.<br>If more than one student is sent to the quiet place, it may become a detention area.<br>An entire class cannot be sent to a quiet place. (Seldom need to do so).<br>Teachers may not accept non-punitive nature of the alternative. |
| Alternative programs within the school (Voluntary transfers between classrooms) | Any opportunity whereby a student or parent may select an alternative to the assigned class. May be permanent. May be temporary way to withdraw from or avoid an immediately frustrating situation. May be teacher or student initiated for sound educational purposes. Should be non-punitive. | Recognizes different learning/teaching styles.<br>Individual needs and interests can be considered.<br>Discipline problems are prevented from becoming severe.<br>Students are stimulated and motivated.<br>Students are not simply "dumped" to get rid of problems.<br>Permits non-punitive way for teachers and students to avoid normal personality conflicts.<br>Can address school causes for problems. | Alternatives are in danger of becoming isolated.<br>Stigma may be attached to students who participate.<br>Can become equivalent to in-school detention.<br>Can become a "dumping ground".<br>Teachers may resent giving students an "escape."<br>Staff may take transfer personally.<br>Violates belief that all classes should be alike. |
| Alternative Schools (temporary) | The student is removed to an alternative school setting which offers individualized teaching and counseling. The goal is to rehabilitate the student and enable him/her to go back to the regular school situation. | Students can receive needed individual help and counseling.<br>Causes of problems can be more easily determined when individual help is available.<br>Disruptive students are removed from the school and put into situations where they can be productive. | Genuine learning opportunity must be offered;<br>Danger of becoming "dumping grounds" for problem students.<br>Alternative schools are expensive. |

| Approach | Definition | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alternative Schools (permanent) (Voluntary transfers to other schools) | Students who do not respond well either academically or behaviorally to assigned school settings may elect to attend an alternative school which may offer a variety of learning options. Difficult to generalize because variety and quality differ so much. | Usually provide more individualized instruction.<br>Programs offer more choice and meet student needs and interests.<br>Teaching methods are selected to fit student learning styles.<br>A new setting offers a "fresh start."<br>Students learn to choose, take responsibility (unless they are sent to school as punishment).<br>Programs can be tailored to interests, learning styles, etc.<br>Staff can be freed to address school causes for problems. | Can be expensive.<br>Require much communication with parents so that programs which differ from "regular" school are understood.<br>Genuine learning opportunities, not just fun, must be offered.<br>Can be punitive and segregatory.<br>Receiving schools may be inhospitable. |
| Work-study Alternatives | Programs combine school work with on-the-job training. Students spend a portion of the day in classes and work at the job the other part of the day. | Students' self esteem and feeling of responsibility is increased.<br>Boredom and frustration are lessened.<br>Peer norms work to create pride.<br>Motivation is increased as school work seems more relevant.<br>Students have an opportunity to explore careers.<br>Students and coordinators may relate productively. | Staff may view program as a dumping ground.<br>Tracking minority students or poor students into work-study programs may deny them academic excellence of which they are capable.<br>Participation sometimes means a student has less chance of being admitted to college.<br>Teachers sometimes resent students in academic classrooms. |
| Alternative experiences for students (within or among classrooms or schools or community) | A variety of experiences are provided within or outside the classroom. The curriculum is adjusted and methods are organized to provide for choice, exploration, problem solving, and active learning. Examples are special projects, library research, work-study experiences, working with media, art experiences, peer tutoring, etc. | Reduces chance of pushing student into corner.<br>Challenge and a channel for energy are provided.<br>Students become involved, less interested in causing problems, less easily distracted, and less tense and hostile.<br>Self-esteem is increased.<br>Making choices is taught and learned.<br>Meets more interests.<br>Reduces school causes for problems.<br>Puts responsibility on student; teaches self-discipline. | Extra work is required on the part of the teacher.<br>Organization and planning is needed.<br>May reduce teacher contact with student.<br>May let important instruction "slip between cracks". |

39

40

# APPENDIX B

## Successful School Discipline Programs

### I. Programs Emphasizing Staff Development

**Focus:** Faculty Seminar

**Contact:** Geneva Hawkins, Emma J. Woerner Middle School, 1418 Norton Avenue, Louisville, Kentucky 40420 *(Integrated Education*, July, 1976).

**Description:** A school staff engaged in a three-day seminar to explore the relationship between school problems and cultural differences. Teachers discussed common problems, listened to taped interviews with students, identified conflict and strategies for handling it, and examined their own behavior for causes of discipline problems. The seminar prompted the staff to plan and personally contact parents to attend a "Parent Involvement Rap Session." As a result, the "Woerner Hot Line," a school directory, and a school newspaper were established to facilitate communication. Since the seminar, staff members have consistently engaged in rap sessions focusing on current problems; students have been involved in "Peer Rap Sessions;" and an annual Ethnic Heritage Fair has involved the total school and many community members.

**Focus:** Faculty Workshop

**Contact:** Marvin L. Grantham, Herbert Marcus Elementary School, Dallas School District, 3700 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas *(Phi Delta Kappan*, June, 1976).

**Description:** Ten staff development sessions during early release time focused on the question of how teachers affect children and become part of the discipline problem. Teachers analyzed classroom management techniques which affected their disciplinary responses to certain pupil behaviors. A program of action utilized the Fink Interaction Analysis system. Additional methods, such as increasing school-sponsored activities; increasing tutorial efforts; lunching with students; and implementing a student-established code of unacceptable behaviors were adopted. The result was a marked decrease in the number of referrals and significant gains in pupil achievement as indicated on standardized tests. Since the workshop, the school has undergone dramatic changes due to a desegregation order, and teacher in-service is focusing on cultural differences and greater teacher involvement in community and student affairs.

**Focus:** Teacher Study Groups

**Contact:** Richard A. Granum, rural community, northeast Georgia ("Teacher Study Groups: Do They Make a Difference?" in *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, March, 1975).

Description: A series of 10 meetings involved principals, teachers, and aides. Agreeing that the problem student is one who is discouraged in the quest to attain goals, the participants began training in identification of the goals of behavior. Discussion focuses on the book *Maintaining Sanity in the Classroom* with participants involved in small problem-solving groups. Using the Walker Behavior Identification Checklist, participants noted marked improvement in the behavior of students and a decrease in the number of referrals.

**Focus:** Social Literacy Training

**Contact:** Alfred Alschuler, Solomon Atkins, *et. al.* ("Social Literacy: A Discipline Game Without Losers," *Phi Delta Kappan*, April, 1977). Alschuler, Alfred, *et. al. A Primer for Social Literacy Training: Liberating Approaches To the Discipline Problem*, Social Literacy Project, 456 Hills South, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01002.

**Description:** Educators were brought together to engage in a "consciousness raising" process called "Social Literacy Training." Participants focused on bringing common problems to attention, becoming aware of system causes of problems, and taking action to improve the system. The group created a "survival guide" which specified the formal and informal rules of the school; made plans for orientation of new teachers; explored causes of teacher stress; and observed students to determine factors, such as the public address system, which were related to high levels of disruption. Group members were oriented to look for and prevent **system causes** of problems as opposed to **person blaming**. Social Literacy Training works to change oppressive rules and practices, not people.

**Focus:** Building on Positive Characteristics

**Contact:** Ms. Marilyn Brannigan (former principal) now Executive Secretary, Central New York School Study Council, Syracuse University, 499C Huntington Hall, 150 Marshall St., Syracuse N.Y. 13210, (315) 423-4696.

**Description:** At Charles Andrews, an elementary school organized with teachers in multi-grade-age teams, students are assigned to homerooms based on positive relationships with the teacher. Either students or adults can request changes. The instructional program is geared to challenging and successful learning experiences. The elements most responsible for success are adult unity and capitalizing upon positive characteristics of students and adults as well as the environment. Teachers as well as students are considered learners. Strength bombardment identifies resources in the school. "Pride Notes" are sent home when students do good things, and positive matters are the subject of intercom announcements. Parent volunteers often work with advanced students, freeing teachers to work with individuals. A service team helps teachers diagnose and create solutions. Unacceptable behavior is handled one-to-one; irrelevant behavior is ignored; and positive behavior is lauded. Problem-solving and divergent thinking are part of the daily curriculum. Each parent is met at least once the first semester; home visits and parent participation insure contact. Ninety parents volunteer each week. Teachers report classes are the best ever; problems in the lunchroom have diminished; major crises have disappeared; people smile and are interested in school—all signs of success.

### II. Community Involvement

**Focus:** Integrating Community Efforts

**Contact:** Arsenal Tech High School, Indianapolis, Indiana (Described in "Report of the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency," U.S. Senate, February, 1977).

**Description:** The school integrates in one location the traditional educational program with a variety of other social services. A similar program is the Yerba Buena High School Interagency Team in San Jose, California. Such programs break down the barriers which usually exist between schools, police, probation and social agencies.

**Focus:** Maximizing Positive Confrontations in a School

**Contact:** Terry Steele (Former Assistant Principal), now Principal, Princeton Jr. High School, 1157 Chester Road, Cincinnati, Ohio 45246.

**Description:** Staff members in a Columbus, Ohio, junior high school in a low socioeconomic area initiated a program to: (1) make the school safe for learning; (2) make parents and students feel it was their school; and (3) use positive confrontations to make immediate, fair, and humanizing decisions with students and community groups. Faculty and staff developed greater sensitivity to the needs of the community and greater awareness of responsibility for serving those needs. Activities included a Dial-A-Tutor program to help students with homework, making visits to 80 percent of the students' homes,inviting parents to school to review individual test scores, and developing a "Homework Pledge" which parents and students signed. Transactional Analysis groups helped teachers and students with personal and professional frustration. Teachers participated in workshops on teaching reading in the content areas. Weekly announcements recognized student achievements in various areas.

## III. Student Self-Help and Involvement

**Focus:** Peer Group Counseling

**Contact:** Norma Oeffinger, Guidance Counselor, Canton Local School District, Canton, Ohio *(Ohio Schools*, January, 1977).

**Description:** The guidance counselor trains students who act as counselors in dealing with such problems as school alienation, runaways, and alcohol abuse. Special features of the program include "Teen Talk," which involves senior high school students in a counseling program on drugs for elementary students; "Project Search," a program designed to strengthen the high school student's self-concept; and Program for Alternatives Cooperative Education, an alternative school.

**Focus:** Peer Group Counseling

**Contact:** John Robert Giles, Lower Valley Youth Service Bureau, McAllen, Texas ("Positive Peer Culture in the Public School System," *NASSP Bulletin*, January, 1975).

**Description:** The purpose of the program is to help students to help themselves and develop responsibility for their own behavior. Sexually-segregated groups contain no more than 10 students per counselor, with priority given to students with severe problems. Sessions are held after school hours in comfortable surroundings. Mr. Giles reports that after-school sessions are well attended, even if students have been absent from school, and teachers state that behavior is much improved as a result of the program.

**Focus:** Law Related Education for Students

**Contact:** Donald Thomas, Superintendent, Salt Lake City Schools, Salt Lake City, Utah. ("Solving Discipline Problems Through Law Related Education," *NASSP Bulletin*, January, 1976).

**Description:** Trained teachers conduct seminars involving both parents and students as participants. Sessions are designed to analyze the legal concepts of authority, justice, responsibility, due process, and property by engaging the participants in mock trials and role playing. Attorneys are available for further discussion. Participants become aware of alternative methods of resolving conflicts and disputes.

**Focus:** Guidance-oriented Hearings

**Contact:** Mrs. Grace Walls, Coordinator of Disciplinary Action, Newark Board of Education, 2 Cedar Street, Newark, N.J. 07102. Phone: 201-733-7192.

**Description:** The coordinator serves as a hearing officer in cases referred voluntarily by school principals who want assistance with students who have not responded to previous suspensions. The focus of the informal hearing is not punitive but to provide guidance and to get services for the student. The hearing is attended by a Child Study Team (mandated by law in New Jersey) which diagnoses the student's needs, may administer tests including psychiatric, and may classify the student in terms of special needs and special education. If diagnosis shows the student should return to regular schooling, the team recommends various alternative assignments. The hearings iron out problems that arise when school personnel don't listen to the student or need new skills for responding in positive manner. Parents also get help from agencies through the team's efforts. Success of program is indicated as due process reduces the number of students sent home for indefinite periods with no help.

## IV. Alternative Forms of Punishment

**Focus:** In-School Suspension

**Contact:** Jim Goluska, Social Studies Teacher, Columbia Heights High School, Minneapolis, Minnesota (Described by Diane M. O'Brien, "In School Suspension: Is It the New Way to Punish Productivity?" *American School Board Journal*, March, 1976).

**Description:** As an alternative to at-home suspension, students are given in-school suspension after exhibiting severe behavior problems such as smoking pot, using drugs, or engaging in violence on school grounds. Students are assigned to a suspension room for two to five days and are not allowed to exercise the usual privileges (e.g., lunch with peers; participation in extracurricular activities). All are required to complete their regular classroom assignments, in addition to those given by Mr. Goluska, and no talking is allowed. Mr. Goluska works closely with parents, county welfare and juvenile officers, and the school psychologist in order to help students work out their problems. Only 23 out of 173 students referred to the in-school suspension program are repeaters. Parents are supportive and often request the action.

**Focus:** Individualized Counseling and Behavior Contracts

**Contact:** Bill Bell, Greenhills-Forest Park School District, Cincinnati, Ohio.

**Description:** One counselor is employed on a full-time basis to give a "last chance" to students who have "fallen through the help system." Goals are to find new help areas

for each student and to use them differently. A team effort is launched, beginning with an explicitly written contract, specifying behaviors expected of all parties, which is made between the student, parents, teachers, school, and sometimes the court and psychologist. The student knows where he or she stands and knows consequences of actions. The counselor follows through in an individual program which helps the student to fulfill the contract.

**Focus:** Behavior Contracts

**Contact:** Roland Betts, former Assistant Principal, Englewood Middle Schools, Englewood, New Jersey (Described in "Report to the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency," U.S. Senate, February, 1977).

**Description:** Developed as an alternative to suspension, the program involves an individualized contract. Students involved meet with the principal or assistant principal and an "official", legalistic-sounding contract is formally drawn up. Students sign and give their word not to break the agreement. Since contracts have been instituted, almost none have been broken and suspensions have been significantly reduced.

## V. Alternative Educational Settings

**Focus:** Work-Study Alternatives

**Contact:** Phillip A. Viso, Director, The Industrial Skills Center, Lawd Lawndale Area, Chicago, Illinois. (Described in Children's Defense Fund, *School Suspension: Are They Helping Children?).*

**Description:** Academic and vocational training are combined within a work-study framework. Students attend traditional classes in the morning and devote their afternoons to working on special projects funded by local corporations. The program is attended by students who previously held attendance records of 10 or 15 percent and now possess records which are higher than any other high or vocational school. There have been no suspensions in the six years of the program. Program features are a skilled and humane staff, flexible programming, individualization, realistic vocational training, the opportunity to earn money, small student population, racially balanced staff, and time for student counseling.

**Focus:** Alternative Educational Settings

**Contact:** Patrick Henry, Director, School Delinquency Intervention Program, Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation, Evansville, Indiana (Described in "Report of the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency," U.S. Senate, February, 1977).

**Description:** Students with special problems are referred to an Educational Extension Center which provides small classes and individualized instruction and counseling and emphasizes the involvement of parents and other social agencies. Follow-up services are available after the student returns to the regular classroom situation.

**Focus:** IGE Program; Teacher-Student-Home Linkages

**Contact:** Gregory Caras, Principal, Longfellow IGE Magnet School, 245 Salem Avenue, Dayton, Ohio 45406.

**Description:** The key to the school's disciplinary climate is a close advisor-advisee relationship in which each child is assigned an adult (not necessarily a subject-matter teacher) who is a counselor, a listener, a contact with the school structure and a close link between home and school. Advisors are assigned randomly, but the team or the principal or the student can initiate changes to achieve satisfactory relationships. Time is set aside to allow teachers to develop relationships and in-depth knowledge about each student—once a week in the beginning, less frequently after rapport develops. The Principal's office is always open to students; time is scheduled to encourage students to visit freely. The school is modeled closely after the Wisconsin IGE school, multi-aged, non-graded classes; teachers working in units (teams); and curriculum development matched to students' pace. Teachers work in "Learning Communities"—6 teachers, 200 students. The Coordinator (one of the six) is the first person who sees the student if another teacher needs assistance. If necessary, the principal is the third step. The first step in the discipline program is contact with the home; teachers visit homes before school starts; the school sponsors klatsches with parents. As problems arise, teachers confer with parents. Then a contract is signed by parents, student, and teacher. No student has been suspended in three years; the basic "punishment" is to deprive the student of rewarding activities. The principal feels that the administrator sets the tone, must love students, show affection, and be with the students. Administrators are outside at lunch and after school when the buses come. "Students can count on us. Rain or shine, we're there."

**Focus:** Desegregated School; Open Relationships with Students, Home

**Contact:** Robert R. Cannarozzi, Principal, Whittier Elementary School, 721 Miami Chapel Road, Dayton, Ohio 45408.

**Description:** The school was desegregated in 1976 as part of a court-ordered plan. The student population, formerly totally black, is now 52 percent black. Three schools, separated by a river, were clustered to achieve desegregation; the other two served low-socioeconomic-level Appalachians. The three school staffs used a university auditorium to hold information sessions for parents from all three schools, established rapport and calmed fears, stressed reading and math programs. The discipline program is based upon close, open relationships with parents which are established by home visits teachers make before the school year starts and during the year. The principal and assistants maintain relationships with students through a student-elected President's club for grades 4, 5, and 6, and a Principal's Advisory Council, also student-elected for grades 7 and 8, which meets with the principal weekly. The two groups are presented with problems the staff sees; they present problems students see. Time is set aside on Fridays for classes to discuss problems and to recommend solutions to the faculty. The school has very few rules. A dress code is strongly supported by parents. Teachers have no non-teaching duties since administrators use the playground, hall, bus duty, etc., to maintain contact with students. Success is measured by such factors as: practically no suspensions; a warm climate among people in the school; less teacher absence; staff doesn't leave early; no abuses of freedoms given staff; parents ask to remain in the school instead of returning to former neighborhood schools (white); 8 to 10 of the top math students from 10 schools were from Whittier.

# The Many Faces of School Organization

by
Joseph R. Rogus

*"Is the middle school a more effective form of school organization for pre and early adolescent youngsters than is the junior high?"*

*"Is I.G.E. effective?"*

*"Do students in nongraded schools achieve as well as youngsters in graded programs?"*

*"Do students learn more in small classes?"*

*"Does the fact that students are grouped homogeneously or heterogeneously significantly affect student performance?"*

These are but a few of the questions commonly asked in connection with school organization. Each question is important and complex; each has been studied carefully. They must all be addressed when organizing for instruction.

## ORGANIZATION DEFINED

In a broad sense organization refers to a set of deliberately planned and structured arrangements among people and resources to accomplish a set of goals. Goals in a school system usually reflect residents' prevailing sentiments about what schools should do. Organizational decisions must reflect the system's goals.

From a school system perspective, "organization" commonly refers to the means by which students are arranged into schools for instructional purposes. Organizational options include grade level grouping patterns such as 6-3-3 (elementary, junior high, senior high), 3-3-3-3 (primary, elementary, junior high, senior high), or 8-4 (elementary, secondary). Another option is to narrow the program focus in each of several buildings and have, for example, grades 1-2 taught at one location, 3-4 at another, and 5-6 at yet another.

At the school building level, "organization" refers to the way in which the curriculum is arranged. The school's curriculum may be organized by subject, such as mathematics, social studies or home economics. On the other hand, it may be experience-based with curricular form growing from teacher-student interaction. In some cases, both perspectives may be accommodated.

Vertical and horizontal organization decisions are also made at the building level. Vertical decisions relate to ways pupils are advanced through the school system as they gain in knowledge, skill, and maturity. Graded or nongraded organization, the use of individualized curriculum, and the curriculum model to be employed are matters of vertical organization. Horizontal decisions affect whether pupils are organized for instruction by self-contained classes or by unit teams; or if pupils are grouped homogeneously or heterogeneously (by similar or dissimilar personal characteristics).

Closely related to vertical and horizontal decisions are decisions relative to class size. While the central office allocates staff to buildings in light of budget limits, variations in class size within a building are normally decided at the building level.

In essence, the concept "organization" has many faces. It has a singular meaning in that it defines a relationship between school structure and learning outcomes; and, as indicated in Figure 1, the term has multiple dimensions when applied to specific organizational questions at school system and building levels.

## THE FALLACY OF THE SINGLE BEST WAY

Historically American educators have sought the single best way to educate its citizens, the best form of organization, the best curriculum pattern, and the best instructional approach. David Tyack observes in his chronicle of this effort, **One Best System**, that the search for a single perfect set of solutions is futile (Tyack, 1974).

If the goals of all schools were identical, it might well be possible to identify a single organizational format to achieve that set of goals. If however, the goals of school systems and schools differ, and they do, the structures for achieving the diverse goals will also differ. There cannot be a single best curriculum pattern, a best horizontal or vertical organization or a best class size because of the diversity of school purposes and the diversity of individual student needs.

There are several defensible ways of organizing schools from both a system and building perspective. The effectiveness of a structure can only be assessed in relationship to its utility for achieving a set of specified ends. For this reason, means questions addressed by themselves have little significance. Is homogeneous grouping effective? Are nongraded programs effective? These are irrelevant questions unless one identifies effective for what. The best organization depends on the ends identified, the plausibility of the organizational vehicles selected to achieve those ends, and the effectiveness of implementation efforts.

The absence of a single best way to organize does not mean that all patterns and choices are good. Evaluation is needed of the effectiveness of various patterns. A great deal

of both "armchair" study and empirical research have been focused on this question.

The research findings presented within the following sections are not unquestioned truth, but represent an attempt to define meaningful conclusions from the data available. They cannot be generalized to each and every school situation for a number of reasons. First, there is little consistency in the research designs used to assess the effectiveness of each program. Second, the outcomes of research focusing on given organizational approaches such as team teaching or homogeneous grouping are often affected in unknowable ways by uncontrolled variations in teacher difference, curriculum objectives, organization of space and learning activities. Finally, there is no universal formula for implementing new organizational patterns.

**Figure 1**

**School Organization:**
**School System and Building Decisions**

**I. School System Organization Issues**

A. Student Grouping Organization for Grade 1-12
   1. Elementary and Secondary: 8-4, 7-5, 6-6
   2. Elementary, Junior High, Senior High: 6-3-3
   3. Elementary, Middle School, Secondary: 5-3-4, 6-2-4, 4-4-4

B. Student Grouping Within Elementary
   1. Primary and Elementary: 3-3
   2. Princeton Plan: 2-2-2

*(Building A houses grades 1 and 2, B houses grades 3 and 4, and C houses grades 5 and 6.)*

C. Curricular Organization
   1. Subject
      a. Separate Subjects
      b. Broadfield
   2. Experience Centered
   3. Core
   4. Combinations
      a. 1 and 2 above
      b. 1 and 3 above
      c. 1, 2 and 3 above

**II. Building Level Organization Issues**

A. Vertical Organization
   1. Non-graded
   2. Graded
   3. Patterns for Individualizing
      a. Diagnostic - Prescriptive
      b. Personalized
      c. Self-Directed
      d. Independent Study
      e. Combination of a and d

B. Horizontal Organization
   1. Self-Contained Classes
   2. Departments
   3. Teams (Units)
   4. Homogeneous - Heterogeneous Grouping

C. Class Size
   1. Fixed size by class
   2. Fixed size by unit or team
   3. Flexible size by class
   4. Flexible size by unit or team

## ORGANIZATIONAL OPTIONS: SCHOOL SYSTEM LEVEL

### Grouping Options

Every school system makes a decision on how to group students. Hypothetically, this structural decision flows first from an analysis of the educational goals established by the community for its schools, and secondly, from a consideration of the "practical" limiting factors such as money and classroom space available. Adjustments to initial arrangements are frequently made solely in response to the practical press of enrollment pressures, court order and/or financial shortage, rather than for educational reasons.

Possible student grouping arrangements are numerous. However, a few basic patterns dominate:

1. **The elementary-secondary pattern.** The 8-4 pattern of school organization was the pattern of school organization in the United States until 1896. Approximately 25 percent of the nation's school districts still employ it. Variations to this form include the 7-5 organization, the Virginia Plan, and the 6-6, which is still found in some rural areas.
2. **The elementary-junior high-high school pattern.** The junior high school gained popularity after 1910 and its expansion was rapid after World War I. Approximately one-third of the nation's districts employ this pattern and the percentage is higher in large city systems. In 1970, approximately 75 percent of school systems of 25,000 or more pupils employed junior high schools. The junior high organization was created to bridge the gap between the elementary and high school by offering a program to youngsters that was more challenging and useful than the work of the upper elementary grades.
3. **The elementary-middle school-high school pattern.** The middle school pattern is the newest of the common organizational patterns, having developed in the

1960's. The 5-3-4 form is the most common. Variations include the 6-2-4 and 4-4-4 forms. The "middle school" is first and foremost a concept and secondarily a form of organization. The concept was popularized in response to several factors: (1) the conventional junior high was perceived by many to be inappropriate to the needs of earlier maturing adolescent youngsters; (2) the junior high had evolved in many communities into simply a miniature high school; (3) the middle school offered a partial solution to pressures to desegregate; and (4) many believed that reorganization might serve as a vehicle for promoting renewed commitment to personalized and individualized instruction, team teaching, integrated studies and other desired educational changes (Van Til, 1970).

For these reasons, the middle school concept has substantial support. However, its growth and development has been somewhat limited because a reduction in the number of school age children since the 1960's has necessitated fewer new buildings, and, for one reason or another, teacher education institutions and certification authorities have been unable to agree on any distinct set of preparation standards for middle school teachers.

*Elementary School Modifications*

Historically, organizational changes have affected the early adolescent (the creation of junior high and middle schools). Although modifications at the elementary level are recent, examples of the 3-3 elementary organization and the Princeton Plan where whole buildings are designated for only one or two grades, are now found in several cities. These changes are justified as a way to facilitate concentrated planning and instruction. In some instances, particularly where the Princeton Plan is used, desegregation is a major incentive.

*Research and System Grouping Options*

Little systematic research exists on the effectiveness of systemwide grouping patterns, and understandably so. Organization by age group creates a framework within which programming takes place; it does not determine that programming. The middle school may be a most defensible concept for the education of early adolescents, for example, but the creation of a middle school guarantees nothing. The effectiveness of any organization depends on the quality and the interaction of other crucial factors, particularly program planning, staff effectiveness, and program implementation.

It is impossible then to state that one form of organization is better than another. Location of grade levels is relatively insignificant. Much more important to the achievement of quality education are system decisions on curricular organization and, at the building level, decisions on vertical and horizontal organization.

## Curriculum Organization

Schools plan, direct and guide experiences for the student. Those experiences are the curriculum. They include co- or extra-curricular activities as well as the program carried out during the defined school day.

In a more specific sense, curriculum is the outcome of the processes of goal setting, establishing program objectives, selecting and organizing content and learning experiences, implementing, and evaluating program effectiveness. Setting goals is the first step in the curriculum development process. It leads to decisions on curriculum organization. These organizational conclusions set limits on the instructional objectives and the services to be delivered to pupils.

Differences in emphasis on common goals are reflected in the three broad centers that generally organize curricula: (1) subject matter derived from the disciplines; (2) the child as person and learner; and (3) societal need. None of the centers are mutually exclusive. It is possible for the curriculum of a single school to incorporate all three emphases, but more often than not, one pattern tends to predominate.

*Subject Centered*

Advocates of the subject matter-centered approach assert that useful knowledge is found in the disciplines. The desirable intellectual skills of observing, classifying, measuring, communicating, experimenting, and interpreting data cannot be developed apart from substantial bodies of relevant knowledge (Ebel, 1972).

If subject matter is the exclusive organizing center, curriculum will focus on specific "pure area" subjects such as history, English and mathematics, or on broad fields or integrated areas such as social studies, general science and language arts. A combination of specific subjects and broad fields is also common.

The subject matter focus is the most common curriculum emphasis at all levels of schooling. Citizen response to Gallup and Phi Delta Kappan polls and the popularity of fundamental schools established in several cities as magnets to promote pupil desegregation indicate that this approach is also popular.

*Child-Centered*

The second focus, the child, is the most misunderstood and maligned of the organizing centers. In this approach, the primary purpose of schooling is to free individuals to achieve their potential. The primary focus is on the learner and the psychological order of learning. The child-centered position does not implicitly deny the importance of the substance of subject-centered curricula, a frequent misinterpretation. Rather, emphasis is shifted from taking some logical order of subjects and teaching it to pupils to selecting subject material most relevant to where the student is in ability and interest (Dewey, 1902).

If the child is the organizing center for program development, an activity curriculum results, and heavy emphasis is placed on creating a stimulating environment. Students are encouraged to set their own goals and objectives, select and organize the content and experiences to achieve those objectives, and assess their effectiveness. A major goal of the child-centered approach is to promote independent learning; subject emphases are neither predetermined nor precluded. At the elementary level, the child-centered approach and open education are closely allied; at the secondary level, independent study, student developed courses and "schools without walls" reflect this position.

In a pluralistic society, the child-centered and subject-centered approaches are each defensible forms. Both perspectives are legitimate, and research indicates few significant differences in the long-term effects of the two approaches upon learner behavior. In fact, data from several comparative studies show that where differences do exist, students enrolled in or graduated from child-centered programs have performed better than their counterparts involved in

**Figure 2**

## Characteristics, Advantages, and Disadvantages of Patterns of Curricular Organizations*

| | Characteristics | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|---|---|---|---|
| A **Subject Centered** Subject Curriculum | organized in accord with division of labor in research | 1. allows for systematic transmission of culture<br>2. communication is enhanced between college and lower schools, between scholar and teacher<br>3. teachers and materials are easily integrated into the pattern | **In practice:**<br>1. curricula tend to fragment learning<br>2. needs of learners are often ignored<br>3. social problems are often unaddressed<br>4. logical organization of subject may not be related to psychological learning order |
| A **Subject Centered** Broad Fields | 1. offering which combines concepts and skills from many disciplines<br>2. organized in terms of important ideas which explain reality (American Studies) or by topical studies | 1. many of advantages of the subject curriculum<br>2. possibility for helping learners see relationships among separate subjects | 1. restricts studies in-depth in single areas<br>2. distorts logical pattern of the discipline<br>3. material and human resources are often hard to find |
| B **Child Centered** Activity | 1. children's interests determine curricular structure<br>2. common learnings result from shared interests<br>3. not planned in advance<br>4. problem solving approach dominant | 1. guarantees central place of the learner in the curriculum<br>2. provides encouraging structures for personal learning<br>3. calls for highly qualified teachers<br>4. decreases gap between work and play, school and life | 1. may ignore important social learnings<br>2. sequencing becomes a problem<br>3. makes organized study of subject matter difficult<br>4. demands on teachers are heavy<br>5. curriculum may lack essential continuity |
| C **Society Centered** Core | 1. focuses on societal needs as: adolescent needs, social problems, social functions<br>2. cooperative planning among students and teachers is encouraged | 1. bears directly on problems of everyday life<br>2. integrates knowledge and skills<br>3. encourages group problem-solving<br>4. provides for consistent evaluation of school and society | 1. problem of determining scope and sequence<br>2. teaching aides are not available in abundance<br>3. distorts logical patterns of disciplines |

*Adapted from Smith, Stanley, Shores, *Fundamentals of Curriculum Development*. New York: World Book Co., 1950.

subject-centered programs, even on standardized achievement tests (Jennings and Nathan, 1977).

*Society-Centered*

Four fundamental beliefs are the basis for the societal-need focus for curriculum: (1) intellectual training should be directed to understanding the forces of the culture and to mastering the intellectual tools necessary for that understanding; (2) the school has a fundamental responsibility for transmitting the culture's essential values; (3) since society and culture are changing, it is the task of schools to play a constructive role in that change. Without a continual reorientation to changing conditions the school is unable to prepare youth for life's problems and responsibilities and becomes unreal and useless; and (4) education is a moral undertaking; it begins and ends with value decisions and therefore will always involve an element of prescription.

These beliefs exist on a continuum of immediacy and intensity and range from an action-oriented, social reconstructionist perspective on one end to a social adjustment emphasis on the other. While a range of value positions exists within subject and child-centered curricular forms, neither contains the social threat that is part of the social reconstructionist philosophy.

Society-centered or core curricula seldom are predominating patterns. The beliefs underlying the focus serve in some instances as values which cut across subject or child-centered programs, and the emphasis comes to life in

some social problems and human relations courses. Overall, the impact of the societal-needs focus has been minimal.

In summary, there are three basic patterns of curriculum organization. The subject and child-centered forms exist at times in isolation, as seen in highly specialized academic situations such as the Bronx School of Science and in open-education centers. More frequently, schools adopt an organization which honors two or three of the patterns. In these instances, the subject-center tends to constitute the major focus and the child and/or societal need emphases constitute student alternatives. The comprehensive high school is an example of this combination pattern. As indicated in Figure 2, each curricular form carries with it certain advantages and disadvantages. The best form of organization is that which effectively addresses the educational goals of a given community. Since the different organizational patterns derive from different assumptions, it is extremely difficult to compare them for effectiveness. Regardless of which pattern is selected, it imposes limits on the horizontal and vertical decisions made at the building level.

## ORGANIZATIONAL OPTIONS: BUILDING LEVEL

Once a decision on curriculum organization is made, instructional objectives can be developed by area. Attention must then be given to how to organize staff and students to achieve the outcomes intended (horizontal organization), and how to facilitate pupil progression through the objectives (vertical organization).

A substantial amount of research focuses on the mechanisms used in relation to these questions. In this section, the most commonly used techniques are described, and the related research is reported. The reported findings should be considered in relation to locally desired curricular and instructional outcomes and not as ends in themselves.

### Horizontal Options

Decisions about horizontal organization group professional staff for planning, instruction and evaluation of pupil performance, and group youngsters for instruction.

#### Professional Grouping Options

*Self-Contained Classes*

The self-contained organization by grade is the most common grouping pattern at the elementary and secondary levels. At the secondary level the self-containment occurs within a departmental context. Within the self-contained framework, each teacher is assigned a group of students and is responsible for their instruction. The organization permits pupils and teachers to develop stable relationships and easy administration.

At the elementary level, the degree to which the teacher of the self-contained class is responsible for instruction in all study areas is related to the number and kind of specialist services available in such areas as art, music, and physical education. Assistance of specialists notwithstanding, the elementary teacher's role in the self-contained organization is immensely complex and demanding. In the most common separate subject-broad field curriculum context, for example, the typical teacher is expected to have command of areas studied (mathematics, science, reading, etc.), to be knowledgeable about child development, to be a master of a variety of instructional strategies, to communicate effectively with parents, youngsters and central staff—and, to demonstrate these competencies within a framework that has him/her interacting alone with youngsters almost all of each day. Departmentalization occasionally takes place in areas such as science. This professional grouping pattern appears to be a mixed blessing. It enables teachers to limit their focus and to plan, and youngsters have the opportunity to encounter well prepared teachers in all areas. The limitations are that youngsters have to adjust to several teachers (most experience little difficulty with this), and the content is compartmentalized and fragmented.

Where the self-contained organization is used, cooperative planning between and among staff is normally limited. Even at the secondary level, where the department is the most common form of staff organization, cooperative planning is more general than specific with the general focus being curriculum (what is taught) rather than instruction (how the curriculum is taught).

*The Teaching Team*

Team is defined as an instructional situation where two or more teachers cooperatively plan and evaluate instruction for a given group of students. Members of the team may regroup youngsters assigned to the unit for instructional purposes and may agree to specialize their instructional responsibilities. At the elementary level, labor is most commonly divided for planning purposes, with instruction carried out by all team members in all areas except those for which specialist services are available.

The team organization allows for a flexible approach to instruction. It serves to bring teachers together to discuss common problems, share their expertise, and observe, where the building permits, other types of teaching; it also makes it possible for students to be exposed to the strengths of different teachers.

One commonly employed elementary multi-unit model, I.G.E., recommends that units be made up of 100-150 pupils staffed by a team of three to five teachers, as well as an aide and intern (Sorenson, Klausmeir, Lipham, 1976). Secondary models call for larger numbers of both students and professional staff.

Most research on the organization of staff for instruction focuses on the teaming process. The self-contained pattern is sufficiently established in custom that little research focuses on its effectiveness.

The research on teaming is neither comprehensive nor definitive. Data indicate that effective planning for program goals and cooperation among staff are essential to effective team functioning. Specific advantages of teaming over other forms of organization cannot be demonstrated when standardized achievement tests are used as the focus of comparison. Data indicate however, that both teachers and students involved in team situations express positive attitudes toward their experience within the team and unit setting (Martin and Pavan, 1976).

The absence of more powerful findings on the professional grouping question can be attributed to the wide range of uncontrolled variables within the research conducted. In essence, the effects of grouping patterns have yet to be studied. Until the data are more solid, decisions on staff organization must be made on logic rather than hard data.

### Student Grouping Options

*Homogeneous - Heterogeneous Grouping*

A second horizontal organization decision is how to group pupils for instruction. Students may be classified by age, measured I.Q., sex, achievement, or a combination of variables. Based on one or many of these criteria, students may be organized into homogeneous or heterogeneous groups. Homogeneous groups are those consciously organized on the basis of pupil similarity. Heterogeneous groups are those devised to yield a diverse mixture of children.

The random assignment of youngsters to classes/units at a given grade level constitutes the most common form of heterogeneous grouping at the elementary level. The random assignment of students taking designated courses such as physical education and problems of democracy is similarly common at the secondary level.

Homogeneous grouping has been common in many systems. When organizing students for similarity schools have generally grouped children on the single criteria of achievement or intelligence, and have used this grouping to affect each student's overall school program. Placing students in special education classes on the basis of measured I.Q. scores is a common form of homogeneous grouping. Another common example is rank ordering several sections within a grade level to indicate high to low achievement levels. At the secondary level, tracking by general, vocational, and college preparatory programs was a common form of homogeneous grouping until the court found in *Hobson v. Hansen* (1967) that tracking as practiced in the Washington, D.C. school district was discriminatory. Where homogeneous grouping by class and achievement level now exists, the grouping is more commonly the outcome of student selection than school assignment.

A number of problems have emerged with homogeneous grouping. When homogeneous groups are formed based on standardized measures, it segregates children by socio-economic status and ethnic lines. Another drawback is that homogeneous groups are unreal; most life experiences occur in heterogeneous settings. The most damaging result is that homogeneous grouping may stigmatize those in lower groups and give other children an inflated sense of worth, both of which are damaging.

Findlay and Byran's review (1971) of studies on grouping from 1920-1970 suggests no significant difference in scholastic achievement for students assigned to homogeneous and heterogeneous groups. At the same time researchers indicate that there are noted improvements in student self-concept and attitude toward work after placement in heterogeneous settings (Junnell, 1971). Since cognitive outcomes appear to be the same regardless of grouping arrangements, and there is evidence of social, affective and maturational advantages in the heterogeneous arrangement, homogeneous grouping for overall school programming may not be a valuable option for students.

There are circumstances when groupings are made on a number of variables when homogeneous grouping is valuable. The effects of a program in which youngsters are grouped at the elementary level by achievement for mathematics and reading, by interest in social studies, unified arts and science, and by random selection for physical education and music, would likely be different from those of a program where all class assignments were made on the basis of an overall achievement test score or some other single criterion. Schools need to be able to organize students for instruction in multiple ways. Applying a number of variables is one way to avoid the pitfalls of homogeneous grouping.

## Vertical Options

Regardless of the curricular and horizontal organization decided upon, a major task confronting the school staff is how to facilitate individual pupil growth through the curriculum. Whether or not a school should be organized by grade-levels and finding ways to individualize instruction are major decisions affecting individual pupil growth.

### Graded-Nongraded

The graded school is well rooted in our history. The Quincy Grammar School, started in 1848, was the first to be organized on the graded pattern. By 1860, the graded school was common throughout the United States. The terms "elementary school" and "grade school" were synonymous, and the only disagreement around the "grade" question was how many grades there should be.

The logic for the graded structure was originally clear and simple. Children are very much alike. Differences in pupil progress can be attributed to lack of diligence and attention. Older youngsters should be grouped together and young children should be treated similarly. The larger the number of children, the larger the number of gradations required. Once the number of grades is established, the curriculum can be determined, divided into sections, and allocated to grade levels.

It was not long before the weaknesses in the graded organization began to show. Problems were created by the wide range of student ability in classes and the wide range of achievement at individual grade levels. The placement of new content generated by the beginning of the knowledge explosion posed new dilemmas. The practice of "holding back" pupils at the end of the year was having less than the desired effect; many who were being held back weren't doing any better the second time around.

These problems did not in themselves ignite the development of the non-graded concept. Non-grading evolved from findings in the field of child development, and from acceptance of the notion that there is no such thing as a total class of students at a single level of learning. In refining and popularizing the concept, Goodlad and Anderson (1963), in the now standard *The Nongraded Elementary School*, note the following differences in assumptions between graded and non-graded structures:

| Graded | Nongraded |
|---|---|
| A year of progress in subject matter is seen as roughly comparable with a child's year in school. | A year of school life may mean much more or much less than a year of progress in subject matter. |
| Each successive year of progress is seen as comparable to each past year and each year to come. | Progress is seen as irregular; a child may progress rapidly in one year and quite slowly in another. |

| | |
|---|---|
| A child's progress is seen as unified, advancing in regular fashion in all areas of development; child is probably working close to grade level in most subject areas. | Progress is not unified; a child spurts in one area of progress and lags behind in others; he/she may be working at four or five levels in as many subjects. |
| Specific bodies of content are seen as appropriate for successive grade levels and so labeled; subject matter is packaged grade-by-grade. | Bodies of content are seen as appropriate over a wide span of years; learning is viewed vertically or longitudinally rather than horizontally. |
| Adequacy of progress is determined by comparing a child's attainment to coverage deemed appropriate to the grade. | Adequacy of progress is determined by comparing a child's attainment to his ability and both to a long-term view of the ultimate accomplishment desired. |
| Inadequate work is made up by repeating the work of a given grade; grade failure is the consequence for slow progress. | Slow progress is provided for by permitting more time to do given blocks of work; this implies not repetition but recognition of basic differences in learning rate. |
| Rapid progress is provided for through enrichment, encouragement of horizontal expansion rather than vertical advancement in work; teachers attempt to avoid moving to the domain of the teacher at the grade level above. | Horizontal and vertical progress are allowed for; achieving youngsters are encouraged to move ahead regardless of grade level of work without fear of encroachment of work of the next teacher. |
| Grade to grade movement of pupils is provided for at end of the school year. | Flexible pupil movement; pupil may shift to another class at almost any time; shifts are more common on a quarter or semester basis. |

The nongraded structure is no panacea for problems of curriculum and instruction. The teacher who finds him/herself in a nongraded school will not experience a metamorphasis in his/her teaching. Unless the nongraded concept is understood and internalized, teachers will teach no differently from the way they taught before.

Tewksbury (1967) notes three ways of implementing a non-graded program: (1) providing multi-level instruction in self-contained heterogeneous classrooms; (2) assigning children to self-contained classes according to performance levels; and (3) regrouping a large aggregate of children from time to time to form classes that work at different levels under different teachers.

These implementation styles imply that children are instructed at their own ability levels and work at their own pace. While some programs provide experiences at each child's level of interest and development, in most cases individualization is limited to a pupil proceeding through the same objectives in much the same way, but at their own rates. Nongraded programs have been carried out primarily within the framework of the subject curriculum where teachers retain responsibility for content selection, and a standardized curriculum sequence is required of all children.

Comparative studies generally show that students in nongraded programs do as well or better than their peers in graded programs (Chalfant, 1972; Bowman, 1971; Wilt, 1971). In all comparative studies conducted where students were matched for I.Q., the nongraded achievement scores were significantly higher than the graded. Pavan (1973), in reviewing the research on nongrading from 1968 to 1973, concludes that there should be no concern that placing students in nongraded programs will be detrimental to their academic achievement.

The data suggest that nongraded programs can and do enhance academic achievement and foster positive attitudes among children. This is not to imply that all graded structures should be eliminated or that calling an organization nongraded makes it so. However, the assumptions of the graded structure can be questioned, and efforts on the part of professional staff to incorporate the nongraded approach can be carried out without risk to student growth.

### Individualizing Instruction

Perhaps the most crucial and difficult task facing teachers is that of individualizing instruction, matching instructional outcomes and learning activities to the needs of each child. This is one important element for insuring student progress. Far from being a frill, this is at the heart of quality education. There are many methods for individualizing. These methods can be grouped according to who selects the instructional objectives and the learning activities. Edling (1971) used these criteria and established four models of individualized instruction. They are outlined in Figure 3.

**Figure 3**

**Models of Individualization**

| Model | Source of Objectives | Source of Learning Activities |
|---|---|---|
| Diagnostic-Prescriptive Approach Example: I.P.I. | School determined (teacher) | School determined (teacher) |
| Self-Directed Approach Example: I.G.E. | School determined (teacher) | Learner selected or developed |
| Personalized Approach | Learner selected or developed | School determined (teacher) |
| Independent Study Approach | Learner developed | Learner developed (teacher consulting) |

Each model is defensible for different purposes. Decisions about curriculum organization limit what approaches are appropriate. The diagnostic-prescriptive and self-directed models are commonly employed with subject centered curriculum. The personalized and independent study models are most commonly used with the activity centered curriculum, but may also be used in situations where subject-centered curricula are used.

All four models are time consuming. Time is needed to plan the activities and to consult with students. Teachers may work alone or together from the planning through the implementation phases. The extent to which each model can

be carried out is limited by class number and available teacher support staff.

Commercially developed individualized programs are available for school use. Two popular packages are described.

### The Diagnostic Prescriptive Approach

Individually Prescribed Instruction (I.P.I.) is a popular example of the diagnostic and prescriptive approach to individualization. It has some characteristics of the self-directed model. It may be implemented in a self-contained classroom or in a team arrangement with children moving from one learning area to another.

The system hinges on a wealth of materials, sequentially ordered for systematic progress. Learning objectives and the media for attaining the objectives are carefully programmed. Program materials are available in mathematics, reading, spelling, science, and social education.

Children are tested in each subject area. Based on these results, detailed performance objectives are prescribed for each child. Learning activities are undertaken that are geared to the specifically identified objectives. Pupils proceed independently through the materials with a minimum of instruction from the teacher. Tests are used to evaluate pupil progress.

The teacher's main activities are to evaluate pupil performance, diagnose pupil needs, and prepare learning prescriptions for individual pupils. Frequently staff conferences help insure that each child's prescriptions meet the objectives established for that child. Teacher aides are essential for scoring tests, recording scores and managing materials.

When students in I.P.I. programs and conventional situations are compared, studies show that I.P.I. students achieve on standardized tests as well or better than other students. The most encouraging results are with economically disadvantaged and special education youngsters (Scanlon and Brown, 1971).

The I.P.I. system is effective in schools with the following conditions: (1) a strong investment in cognitive skill development; (2) a commitment to individualize instruction; (3) a desire for accountability; (4) resources to purchase instructional materials in each area focused upon; (5) resources for employing one paraprofessional per classroom; and (6) where appropriate, a willingness on the part of staff to alter their way of instructional behavior.

### The Self-Directed Approach

Individually Guided Education (I.G.E.) is presented as an example of the self-directed model of individualization. I.G.E. requires commitment not only to an individualization strategy but to the multi-unit organization, team teaching, multi-age grouping, role differentiation, shared decision-making, and open communication.

The multi-unit program requires distinct changes in the roles of the principal and teacher. The principal assumes direct responsibility for developing improved educational practices, managing the pre-service and in-service education activities, and administering evaluation activities. A position of unit leader or lead teacher is created. This career teacher chairs team or unit meetings and performs a liaison function between the team and the principal and parents. Other instructional unit members are professional teachers, an aide and, where practicality permits, an instructional secretary and one or more interns.

The individualization system attends to differences in a child's rate and style of learning, level of motivation, and unique educational needs. Instructional objectives are set for each child and materials are selected which are geared to meet the instructional objectives set for each child. Materials are available in reading, mathematics, and motivational procedures. The latter places emphasis on pupils learning to set goals for themselves.

I.G.E. provides for measurement and evaluation that includes preassessment of the child's readiness, assessment of progress, and final assessment. Tests inform both the child and teacher of progress toward the learning objectives.

Preliminary evaluations of I.G.E. program effectiveness indicate positive student performance in the areas of mathematics and reading, a positive relationship between pupil progress in setting goals and achievement in mathematics and reading, and positive teacher attitudes toward both teacher and student materials.

Within class individualization efforts are far more numerous at the elementary than at the secondary level (which includes junior high). Private corporations are more willing to develop individualized materials for elementary use because the subject-centered curriculum is more standardized at this level than the secondary level. In addition, the 50-60 minute periods which typify secondary school schedules make within class individualization more difficult. Finally, it is assumed that because course offerings are offered at differing levels of complexity at the secondary level that students will select themselves into the appropriate classes, making individualization less important. Recent fieldwork by the Institute for Development of Educational Activities and others should offer new breakthroughs for personalized programming at the secondary level.

I.G.E. as a total operational mode has been adopted and adapted in varying degrees. Schools commonly adopt those parts of the I.G.E. concept which fit their particular needs and resources (Hull, 1974). Schools which have the following commitments find I.G.E. a useful and effective model: 1) a willingness to restructure the school organization from the age-grade structure to multi-unit; 2) commitment to a three year staff development program; and 3) resources to hire one aide per unit and to invest in materials and consultative help over the first two years.

### Community and Student Involvement in Individualization Efforts

Efforts at individualizing and personalizing instruction are energy demanding and time consuming. As class group size increases the task becomes more complex. For this reason, most individualization models call for the support of aides, resource people, and student assistants.

Paid help is wonderful, but money need not be an obstacle to progress. In countless communities volunteers provide valuable in-class assistance in the form of tutoring, managing records, monitoring small group work, duplicating materials and assisting teachers with classroom management. Student to student tutorials where older youngsters work with younger students, have proved tremendously useful for recipients of the tutoring and the tutors themselves (Gartner, Kohler, Reisman, 1971). Research on the involvement of non-professionals in classroom efforts indicates that an increased positive attitude toward what the schools are trying to do is a frequent by-product among participants.

### Class Size

Closely related to questions of horizontal and vertical organization at the school level is the issue of class size and its relationship to student achievement. A recent synthesis of the present state of research on the topic indicates that:

1. No optimum class size exists in terms of either pupil achievement or teaching process.
2. Research on the effects of class size on pupil achievement is contradictory and inconclusive.
3. Class size is a matter of serious concern to teachers.
4. Small class size frequently contributes to better teacher morale.
5. Claims for optimum class size are based primarily on presumably desirable classroom activities, not upon achievement (New England Development Council, 1976).

The designation of a single optimal class size is without foundation in fact. The widely accepted ratio of 25 students to one teacher or classroom has no more or less empirical validity than do the numbers 30 or 20.

It must be noted that the matter of pupil-teacher ratio is hardly a closed one. The findings reported are based on the data available, and class-size research has one common shortcoming: the failure to control for important variables other than size which bear on pupil achievement in the teaching situation. The teaching approach, for example, has seldom been controlled.

To be educationally sound, size must vary with the instructional objectives, nature of the subject, and the teaching process. A final conclusion on optimum class size awaits research conducted in tightly controlled situations. In the absence of such research, it behooves all to react with reasoned caution on the topic. Those inclined to attribute mediocre achievement to class size when that size numbers 30 or less might be advised to turn their efforts to examining other variables in the process of instruction. All would do well to avoid legal restriction with respect to class size since grouping flexibility is so essential to effective instruction and could be seriously impeded by numerical limits.

## ORGANIZATIONAL OPTIONS: OHIO STANDARDS AND CUSTOM

In making organizational decisions, it is important to determine whether the local decision fits with the provisions of state standards. The standards are approved by the State Board of Education and serve as guidelines for all systems and schools in Ohio. Separate standards exist for elementary, junior high, and high schools. Following are those sections of Ohio standards dealing with school organization:

#### Elementary Standards (EDb-401-02 and EDb-401-03)*

- Each school system shall have a written statement of philosophy and purpose for the elementary school(s) which should be evaluated annually. Implementation of program should be carried out in accord with this philosophy.
- A school system which has more than one elementary building may have various organizational structures provided they operate within the grade sequence of the elementary school.
- In self-contained situations which are not designated as nongraded or multi-aged groups, no more than two grade levels shall be combined.
- ⅚ of the school program shall be devoted to language arts, mathematics, social studies, science, health, citizenship, related directed study and/or self help activities and optional foreign language; and ⅙ of the school program shall be directed to physical education, music, art, special activities, and optional applied arts.
- Organization for instruction shall be based on those procedures which provide for quality instruction for pupils through effective use of staff and facilities.
- A planned instructional program shall provide for continuous, sequential progress, directed toward diagnosing and meeting the needs of each pupil. This shall be done through organizational and grouping practices on all grade levels and by differentiating learning activities and materials.

*Interpretative and explanatory materials which serve as guides in the application of Minimum Standards are available from the State Department of Education.*

#### Junior High Standards (EDb-405-01 and EDb-405-02)

- Philosophy and goal statement (same as elementary).
- ½ of the school program shall be devoted to language arts, social studies, mathematics, science, and foreign language; ¼ of the program to health and physical education and experience in music, art, applied arts, business, and directed study; and ¼ of the program to curriculum areas as determined by student interest.
- A school may develop experimental programs which depart from the adopted standards with prior approval of the State Department, and it may institute permanent status of such programming with adequate evidence of continuous self-evaluation and approval of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Procedures for approval of experimental programs are: (a) evidence of local board of education approval; (b) submission of written application with complete description of the program; (c) submission of a written evaluation of the program each year for a three year period, if approval is granted; and (d) reporting any changes to the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education.
- The instructional program shall be characterized by well defined objectives and systematic planning by teachers. The program shall give evidence of the adaptation of organization and instructional procedures to meet student needs.

**High School Standards (EDb-403-01 and EDb-403-02)**

- Philosophy and goal statement (same as elementary and junior high).
- 17 units shall be required for graduation as earned above the 8th grade level including:
  - English - 3 units
  - Social Studies - 2 units (1 in American History and Government)
  - Science - 1 unit
  - Math - 1 Unit
  - Health and Physical Education - 1 unit
- Academic courses which require outside preparation shall be scheduled for a minimum of 120 clock hours per year for 1 credit or 60 hours for ½ credit; and laboratory courses requiring little or no outside work shall be scheduled for 160 clock hours or 80 hours for ½ unit of credit; non-academic type courses requiring little or no homework shall be scheduled for a minimum of 120 clock hours per year for one-half unit of credit or 60 clock hours for one-fourth unit of credit.
- All classes should have two meetings a week.
- Experimental designation (same as junior high school).

State standards were developed with the full intent of providing local districts considerable autonomy in the way they function. They do not prescribe in detail what an individual school is to do; they do set responsible lower limits on school behavior.

All schools are mandated to have on file a statement of philosophy and goals. This statement constitutes the basis for all organizational decisions and for this reason is immensely significant.

Varied organizational structures are permitted and different forms of responsible programming, even if they deviate from the facts of the standards, are permitted. The school system must submit their own proposal to the State Department of Education. In the author's experience, State Department officials have been both responsible and reasonable in considering well-stated and locally supported requests for exception.

The subject-centered curriculum is the primary form of curriculum organization recognized within standards. The standards reflect in this sense the will of the greatest majority; they do not preclude an activity organization.

At no place in the standards is reference made to grouping practices, individualization, the self-contained or unit organization, or strategies of teaching and program evaluation. School systems and schools are encourgaed to be creative in engaging these questions. Even in some instances where the standards are specific, they suggest the possibility for creative efforts. In the high school standards, for example, it is stipulated that all classes shall meet a minimum of twice a week. Given that schools are in session for five days, the standard implies a great deal of latitude for creative student groupings, scheduling, and modes of instruction. The junior high standards stipulate that one-fourth of the program shall be devoted to curriculum areas as determined by student interest. Again, there is abundent room for creative programming.

## SUMMARY

An attempt has been made to describe and explain some of the complexities of the task of organizing for instruction. The following major points were developed:

1. There is no one best way of organizing students at the system or district level. There are several best ways depending upon the outcomes desired and the potential for effective implementation.
2. Location of grade level by building is a relatively insignificant factor in determining program effectiveness. Much more important are decisions on curriculum and horizontal and vertical organization, and their implementation.
3. Different forms of curriculum organization begin with different assumptions; therefore, it is impossible to compare in a comprehensive way the effectiveness of the different forms.
4. Curriculum organization decisions set limits on horizontal and vertical decisions.
5. Self contained class and teaching teams are the two most common modes of organizing staff for planning and instruction. One form is not superior to the other. The team organization provides potential for greater staff flexibility, but its effectiveness is determined in large part by the ability of staff to be cooperative in program planning and student assessment processes.
6. Homogeneous or heterogeneous grouping has little effect on academic achievement. There is evidence of social, affective, and motivational advantages to the heterogeneous arrangement.
7. The nongraded structure has resulted in patterns of student achievement equal to or better than that yielded by the graded structure. Many nongraded ideas can be carried out within the graded structure.
8. There are several ways of individualizing instruction, each of which can be effective for different purposes. Programs such as I.P.I. and I.G.E. have proved to be effective in promoting student achievement in situations where they have been effectively implemented.
9. Teachers work hard to individualize instruction. Parents, community volunteers, and students involved in tutorial arrangements have been able to make important contributions to individualization efforts.
10. No optimum class size exists in terms of either pupil achievement or teaching process. To be educationally sound, size must vary with the instructional objectives set, nature of subject taught, and the teaching process used.
11. State standards were constructed with the intent of providing a reasonable minimum to the program. Local districts have considerable autonomy in terms of school system and building decision making.

Program efforts to provide quality learning experiences are underway in almost every school system. The task before all is to assure that high quality is available to all students. Completion of this task requires a disciplined understanding of the complexity of the process of organizing for instruction and a commitment to be supportive of thoughtful efforts to change existing organizational structures where change is called for.

## RECOMMENDED READINGS


Bowman, B. L., "A Comparison of Pupil Achievement and Attitude in a Graded School with Pupil Achievement and Attitude in a Nongraded School—1968-1970," (Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 600 A).

Chalfont, L. S., "A Three Year Comparative Study Between Students in a Graded and a Nongraded Secondary School," (Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 3178 A).

Dewey, J., *The Child and the Curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902.

Ebel, R., "What Schools Are For," *Phi Delta Kappan*, September, 1972.

Edling, J., *Individualized Instruction: A Manual for Administrators*. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon System of Higher Education, 1971.

Findley, W. G. and M. M. Bryan, *Ability Grouping, 1970: Status, Impact, and Alternatives*. Athens, Georgia: Center for Educational Improvement, University of Georgia, 1971.

Gartner, A., M. Kohler, and F. Riesman. *Children Teach Children*. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Goodlad, J. and R. Anderson. *The Nongraded Elementary School*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963.

Hull, R., "Selecting an Approach to Individualized Instruction," *Phi Delta Kappan*, November, 1973.

Jennings, W. and J. Nathan, "Startling/Disturbing Research on School Program Effectiveness," *Phi Delta Kappan*, March, 1977.

Junnel, J. S., "An Analysis of the Effects of Nongrading on a Number of Noncognitive Variables," (Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 94 A).

Martin, L. S. and B. Pavan, "Current Research on Open Space, Nongrading, Vertical Grouping, and Team Teaching," *Phi Delta Kappan*, January, 1976.

NESDEC Study Team, *Class Size and Teacher Load*. Newton, Mass.: NESDC, 1975.

Pavan, P. N., "Good News: Research on the Nongraded Elementary School," *Elementary School Journal*, March, 1973.

Scanlon, R. G. and M. V. Brown, "Individualizing Instruction," in Bushnell, D. and D. Rappaport, *Planned Change in Education*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1971.

Sorenson, J., H. Klausmeir, and J. Lipham, "Definition, Development, and Description of I.G.E.: An Overview," from Sorenson, J., M. Poole, and L. Jayal, *The Unit Leader and Individually Guided Education*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1976.

Tewksbury, J. L. *Nongrading the Elementary School*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Books, Inc., 1967.

Tyack, D. B., *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.

VanTil, W., "Junior High School or Middle School," *Contemporary Education*, XL:4, April, 1970, pp. 222-231.

Wilt, H. J., "A Comparison of Student Attitudes Toward School, Academic Achievement, Internal Structures and Procedures: The Nongraded School Versus the Graded School," (Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 31, 5105 A).


## APPENDIX A

### Schools and School Organizations: A Sample of Well Organized Schools

Following is a listing and thumbnail organizational description of five Ohio Schools at the elementary, middle, junior high, and senior high levels. The listing represents a range in types of well organized schools. The schools identified are only typical of the creative thinking which goes on in many and can occur in all communities toward bringing about quality schooling for all youngsters. The diversity in these examples reinforces the notion that "there are several best ways" to organize a school.

### Senior High Schools

MAGNET HIGH CENTER
2408 Philadelphia Drive
Dayton, Ohio 45406
Principal: Ms. Marguerite Turner

No. of Pupils: approximately 280 students in first semester of each year and 190 students in the second

Pupil Teacher Ratio: 14-1
Student Grouping Arrangement: Grades 11-12

**Curriculum Organization:** Separate Subject, Broad Fields. Courses available to students throughout the city are: Urban Studies, College English, Advanced Chemistry and Physics, Mathematics 4 and 5, Humanities, Classical Piano, Electronic Music, and French, Spanish, and German 3, 4, and 5.

**Horizontal Organization:** Team planning and teaching takes place in the humanities and urban studies. Team planning takes place in the other areas where more than one teacher is involved. Admission to classes is predicated on satisfactory prerequisite work where appropriate, and student interest. Students take only the selected classes at the magnet center and maintain their identity with their comprehensive high school.

**Vertical Organization:** Individualization takes place within the course settings by teacher design.

**Community Involvement and Supportive Assistance to Teachers:** Community resource persons provide valuable input to urban studies classes.

## Middle and Junior High Schools

ALBION MIDDLE SCHOOL
9360 Albion Road
North Royalton, Ohio 44133
Principal: Ms. Pamela Rigg

No. of Pupils: 430
Pupil-Teacher Ratio: 22-1
Student Grouping Arrangement: Grades 6-7

**Curriculum Organization:** Separate Subject, Broad Fields

**Horizontal Organization:** Students are heterogeneously grouped. Professional staff engage in team, cross disciplinary planning.

**Vertical Organization:** Graded structure. Non-graded principles adhered to within program implementation. Teacher designed individualization efforts are many.

**Community Involvement and Supportive Assistance to Teachers**

Aides: a library and an instructional aide, lunch aides
Volunteer Support: 40-50 community volunteers provide instructional support assistance to faculty

WHITNEY YOUNG JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
17900 Harvard Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44128
Principal: Mr. Daniel Drake

No. of Pupils: 750
Pupil-Teacher Ratio: 29-1
Student Grouping Arrangement: Grades 7-8-9

**Curriculum Organization:** Separate Subject, Broad Fields

**Horizontal Organization:** Heterogeneous grouping in physical education, home economics, and industrial arts. Achievement grouping in other areas. Staff is organized by department for planning purposes.

**Vertical Organization:** Graded structure. Teacher designed individualization within the course structure.

**Community Involvement and Supportive Assistance to Teachers**

Aides: instructional and clerical aides
Volunteer Assistance: tutorial assistance provided within the guidance and media center programs

## Elementary Schools

GRANT ELEMENTARY
1470 Victoria Avenue
Lakewood, Ohio 44107
Principal: Ms. Martha J. McNeil

No. of Pupils: 525
Pupil-Teacher Ratio: 27-1
Student Grouping Arrangement: K-6

**Curriculum Organization:** Separate Subject, Broad Field

**Horizontal Organization:** Staff is organized by teams for planning purposes. Pupils are assigned to multi-aged units. Each of the five units encompasses two-age levels. In addition, there is one self-contained class.

**Vertical Organization:** Non-graded structure with teacher-developed individualization approaches.

**Community Involvement and Supportive Assistance to Teachers**

Aides: instructional aides
Community Volunteers: 60+ parent and community volunteers provide instructional support to teachers

VIVIAN L. SMITH ELEMENTARY
535 Wyleswood Drive
Berea, Ohio 44017
Principal: Mr. Terry Krivak

No. of Pupils: 440
Pupil-Teacher Ratio: 24.5-1
Student Grouping Arrangement: K-6

**Curriculum Organization:** Separate-Subject, Broad Fields, and Activity

**Horizontal Organization:** Staff is organized by teams for planning purposes. Students are organized into 5 units, two of which are multi-aged. In other units, pupils are heterogeneously assigned to classrooms.

**Vertical Organization:** Formal structure is graded. Ungraded principles are incorporated throughout the instructional program. Individualization efforts focus on predetermined skill objectives. Physical education program permits student selection from a variety of content alternatives.

**Community Involvement and Supportive Assistance to Teachers**

Aides: instructional, office, and cafeteria aides
Community Volunteers: provide assistance within the instructional program

# EDUCATIONAL OPTIONS:
# Magnet Schools and Programs

by
Daniel U. Levine and Connie Campbell

## INTRODUCTION

Five years ago the term "magnet school" was virtually unknown. Today it is widely used to refer to an important movement for the improvement of public schools, particularly in big cities. Senator John Glenn and other members of Congress have been working to provide substantial funding for the development of magnet school programs. National conferences on magnet schools attracted hundreds of school district representatives to Houston in 1976 and to Dallas in 1977. Magnet programs have already been established in Boston, Cincinnati, Dallas, Houston, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, St. Paul, St. Louis, and other cities. Planning groups for magnet programs are being organized elsewhere.

In fact, the current enthusiasm sometimes borders on suggesting magnets as the cure for all the ills of urban education as well as a quick fix for big city school desegregation problems. A few isolated magnet schools in a big city district will neither desegregate the system nor necessarily improve the overall quality of education.

Although not a cure-all, thoughtfully and carefully planned and executed magnet schools do have a potential for improving the quality of instruction available to students in the public schools. This paper discusses some of the issues to be considered by citizens and school officials contemplating magnet schools.

### Definitions

Magnet school approaches frequently are classified under the more generic label of "alternatives" in education. This label should not be confused with the "alternative" education movement which was fairly widespread in the late 1960's and early 1970's. The alternative education movement was and continues to be primarily concerned with providing personalized and humane instructional programs in both public and private schools. Typically, schools established under this banner have been labeled "free schools" or "experimental" schools which provide less structured programs of instruction than can be found in most public schools.

By way of contrast, magnet or alternative programs (as the term is used in this paper) are public school approaches designed to attract students voluntarily to particular schools. Magnets usually provide special curriculum or a special teaching style. Magnet schools frequently draw enrollment either from a wide geographic area with little or no concentration of students from the community in which the school is located, or serve the neighborhood population plus students from other communities who wish to attend. Magnet programs also differ in whether they are full or part-time for the academic year and whether they include all or part of the population in a given school. They may be administered through regular administrative units responsible for certain geographic regions, or through a special organizational unit for magnet programs. Houston is one of many cities that has magnet schools. Appendix A describes the four types of magnet systems offered in Houston and some single school examples as an illustration of the diversity within the magnet school approach.

Magnet schools have been operating in some cities for many years, although they generally were not so designated until recently. New York has long had specialized district-wide high schools in science and in the arts. Boston's Latin School traditionally has attracted students from throughout the city. Rochester, San Diego, and other school districts have provided specialized, magnet-type programs for elementary students for a number of years, in some cases for decades. Many cities have offered advanced vocational programs at district-wide schools similar to some of the high schools now being established as part of magnet programs.

Because magnet schools are well established in many cities, it is appropriate to ask whether there is anything new about the current magnet school movement. The present movement is distinctive because it aims to serve a much more diverse clientele through more diverse programming than the selective magnet schools of the past. And it is designed to achieve other education goals such as racial and economic desegregation.

Programs are now provided for all students including average achieving students and students whose special talents were generally ignored until recent developments in diversified programming. A few school districts are aiming to enroll a substantial proportion of their students, both elementary and secondary, in magnet programs. In Boston, more than 20 percent of the students in the district are enrolled in the magnet school district. School officials in Cincinnati estimate that eventually as many as 40 percent of the students there will elect to enroll in one or another magnet-type alternative program.

A larger share of students require a wider range of programs. At the high school level, a much greater range of specialized topics is pursued in greater depth than was true in vocational schools which were operated years ago. The range and depth of good district-wide magnet programs are shown in Table 1, which lists the magnet high schools and fields of study planned for 1977-78 in the Dallas Independent School District.

Magnet programs also offer a variety of distinctive educational options at the elementary level. As shown in Table

**Table 1**

## Magnet High Schools and Fields of Study in the Dallas Independent School District

**Arts High School**

| | |
|---|---|
| Graphic Artist | Designer |
| Window Designer | Musician |
| Gallery Employee | Teacher |
| Apparel Sales, Design | Composer |
| Interior Decorator | Sculptor |
| Printmaker | Conductor |
| Art Sales | Dancer |
| Jeweler | Potter |

**Health Professions High School**

| | |
|---|---|
| Dental Assistant | Medical Lab Technician |
| Dental Hygienist | Physical Therapist |
| Oral Surgeon | Pharmacist |
| Dental Technologist | Nurse |
| Dentist | X-Ray Technologist |
| Medical Office Assistant | Physician |
| Veterinarian | |

**Law and Public Administration**

| | |
|---|---|
| Police Officer | Constable |
| Corporate Lawyer | Probation Officer |
| Claims Attorney | Bar Examiner |
| Appeals Reviewer | Urban Planner |
| City Manager | District Attorney |
| Tax Collector | Correction Officer |
| Law Clerk | Police Technician |
| Inspector | FBI Officer |
| Contract Clerk | Detective |
| Assessor | Fish/Game Warden |
| Court Reporter | Corporate Lawyer |
| Security Officer | Para-Legal Personnel |

**Business-Management Center**

| | |
|---|---|
| Credit Manager | Key Entry Operator |
| Bank Teller | Machine Transcriber |
| Stenographer | Administrative Assistant |
| Cashier | Programmer Analyst |
| Legal Secretary | Investment Counselor |
| Accountant | Executive Secretary |
| Auditor | Real Estate Sales |
| Stock Broker | Office Manager |
| Claims Adjustor | Insurance Sales |

**Transportation Institute**

| | |
|---|---|
| New Car Dealer | Collision Estimator |
| Auto Sales | Parts Distributor |
| Finance Officer | Equipment Sales |
| Line Technician | Electrical Engineer |
| Tune-Up Specialist | Automotive Research |
| Body Repair | Automotive Design |
| Refinisher | Front-End Specialist |

**Human Services Center**

| | |
|---|---|
| Social Worker | Rehabilitation Worker |
| Elementary Teacher | Media Aide |
| Child Care Director | Special Education Teacher |
| Librarian | Handicapped Youth Director |
| Secondary Teacher | Mental Health Assistant |
| Media Specialist | Ministerial Personnel |
| Counselor | Social Work Assistant |
| College Teacher | Geriatrics Personnel |
| Child Care Aide | Child Welfare Worker |
| Psychologist | Recreational Worker |
| Juvenile Specialist | Special Area Teacher |

2, which lists the alternative (magnet) programs planned for 1977-78 in Cincinnati, school programs can include themes as divergent as foreign language, the Montessori approach to pre-school and primary grade instruction, and systematic organization for individualizing instruction. Houston (see Appendix A) is operating magnet elementary schools specializing in subjects such as music and literature, and other school districts are establishing their own or comparable variations providing specialized instruction and resources in areas of particular concern to parents and students. Opportunities of this nature have been offered here and there in the past for a few elementary students, but they seldom were available for substantial numbers of students, and they frequently lacked the specialized staff and resources required to make them successful.

The second major characteristic which makes the magnet school movement distinctive is its potential contribution to racial and economic desegregation. Magnet schools may help to overcome harmful social trends which have been causing the deterioration of many urban neighborhoods and have isolated low income students and minority students in "inner city" public schools. These trends will be briefly considered in the next section.

## SETTING AND RATIONALE FOR THE MAGNET SCHOOL MOVEMENT

In many of the nation's largest school districts, a high proportion of the students are from racial minority groups—primarily black and Hispanic. In nearly every big city the percentage of minority students has been climbing for the past 20 to 30 years. Today, for example, more than 60 percent of the students in Philadelphia and 90 percent of those in Washington, D.C., are minority students.

Equally important, the percentage of low income students has been rising at a comparable rate. A large proportion of white and minority middle-income families are withdrawing their children from inner city schools. More than 45 percent of the students in the Cleveland Public Schools now are from poverty families, and many other cities are moving in the same direction.

The resulting pattern of racial and economic isolation in big city school districts has had far reaching effects. For one thing, the pattern has developed in a self-generating manner. As schools become more heavily low status in student composition, middle status families move to the suburbs. As the percentage of poverty students rises, academic performance levels fall; students as well as teachers, administrators, and parents become frustrated and bitter, and additional funds are spent in an attempt to help pupils acquire the skills needed for success later in life.

Meanwhile, however, municipal and school services decline relative to suburban areas as the middle class tax base dries up. Teachers in the public schools spend their time trying to communicate subject matter to students who are not prepared to learn in the way it is being taught. As a result, many students are passed along from grade to grade without mastering basic skills; teachers neglect either low or high achieving pupils or both groups in a fruitless attempt to communicate still more subject matter in accordance with curriculum prescribed for the "average" student; and many participants in this destructive process become still more frustrated and bitter. In short, many public schools have become embattled institutions for processing students through a standardized program of curriculum and instruction which fails to provide them with learning opportunities suited to their individual learning backgrounds and interests.

In this context, the magnet school movement offers hope for enhancing the effectiveness and attractiveness of the public schools. Magnet programs tailored to the learning needs and preferences of differing students may reverse the trends which have been generating racial and economic isolation and unproductive uniformity in urban schools. Middle status families may be persuaded to keep their children in schools which are viewed as providing superior educational opportunities in comparison with the low standards of performance characteristic of inner city schools. Magnet schools can provide racially and economically isolated students increased opportunities to attend schools which are designed to develop their interests and abilities. Options and choices available on a widespread basis make it possible to deliver superior educational services to large groups of students

**Table 2**

**Alternative Programs and Number of Students Enrolled in the Cincinnati Public School District, 1976 to 1978****

| Elementary | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79** | % Black 1976-77 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Applied Arts Academy (1, 4-6)*** | — | 90 | 90 | — |
| Elementary College Readiness (6, 4-6) | 591 | 640 | 640 | 35 to 70 |
| Elementary Math and Science (1, 4-6) | — | 270 | 270 | — |
| French Bilingual (4, K-4) | 437 | 535 | 630 | 45 to 63 |
| Fundamental Academy (2, K-8) | 767 | 760 | 740 | 43 to 55 |
| German Bilingual (2, 1-5) | 381 | 465 | 540 | 53, 59 |
| Individually Guided Education Magnet Schools (6, K-6)**** | 1871 | 2640 | 2605 | 68 to 94 |
| Individual Progress and Social Import (3, K-3) | 301 | 240 | 240 | 50 to 55 |
| Montessori (3, K-5) | 390 | 580 | 580 | 40, 56 |
| Multi-Age (Non-Graded) Magnet (1, 1-6) | 801 | 800 | 780 | 50 |
| Physical Education (1, 4-6) | — | 310 | 310 | — |
| Spanish Bilingual (5, K-4) | 526 | 730 | 845 | 48 to 58 |
| | 6065 | 8060 | 8270 | |
| **Secondary** | | | | |
| Academy of Arts and Sciences (2, 7-10) | 178 | 175 | 170 | 65 |
| City-Wide Learning Community (1, 9-12) | 150 | 150 | 150 | 32 |
| Creative and Performing Arts (1, 7-12)**** | 652 | 735 | 800 | 47 |
| Junior High College Readiness (4, 7-9) | 601 | 590 | 565 | 48 to 66 |
| Walnut Hills Academic Jr. & Sr. High (2, 7-12) | 1867 | 1850 | 1850 | 25 |
| | 3448 | 3500 | 3535 | |
| Total Elementary & Secondary | 9513 | 11560 | 11805 | |

*This list of programs excludes vocational education, special education, open enrollment programs, and reading centers. The list shown here is taken primarily from school district documents describing "Optional programs" in the Cincinnati Public Schools.

**Enrollment figures are for average daily membership. Figures for 1977-78 and 1978-79 are estimated.

***Figures in parentheses show the number of schools offering each alternative program and the grade levels served in 1977-78. For example, (2, 4-6) means that two schools offer a program which enrolls students from grades 4 to 6.

****Includes both elementary and secondary, but predominant enrollment is at level indicated.

Source: Table 1 in *Status Report - Optional Programs*, Cincinnati Public Schools, February 1977.

whose families are disgruntled with the quality of education available in many urban schools.

Time, money, and careful planning over a number of years are needed to accomplish these goals. Social systems as complex and entrenched as urban school districts cannot be easily reformed and revitalized in a short period of time. The problems inherent in initiating and carrying out a magnet school program are bound to reflect a number of difficult underlying issues. We will describe a few of these issues and then will discuss some of the major considerations which citizens and educators must take into account in designing a successful magnet school program.

## ISSUES IN ESTABLISHING A MAGNET SCHOOL PROGRAM

### Open Admissions vs. Specified Entrance Standards

Since one goal of the magnet school movement in many school districts is to retain middle status families and students, it is tempting to establish definite admissions standards which might help convince potential clients that the magnet schools will be enrolling high achieving students similar to those in many suburban and non-public schools. Entrance requirements in a school specializing in a subject like science or the arts also can help ensure that special resources presumably being pumped into these schools will be efficiently expended on students who will put them to good use. Dispensing with entrance standards, on the other hand, is desirable in order to attract previously low-achieving or alienated students who might benefit from attending a different type of school, and middle-status families whose children would not meet entrance criteria in a particular subject.

This dilemma is exemplified in approaches used in Chicago, Dallas, and Cincinnati. Whitney Young High School in Chicago requires that applicants generally achieve at or above average levels for the city as a whole. Without standards of this sort, perhaps it would not be possible to convince middle status parents that opportunities at Whitney Young really will be significantly better than those available in most Chicago high schools.

The nationally-known Skyline Career Development Center in Dallas similarly has specified standards for admission to many of the 24 career fields (e.g. aeronautics, electronics, interior design) in which it offers vocational training for secondary students in that city. While not officially designated a magnet school, the $21.5 million Skyline facility has been functioning as a magnet. In 1976-77 it drew more than 1,200 white students and nearly 900 minority students from all parts of the district.

One disadvantage of this approach is that entrance standards may prohibit admission of many students who could benefit the most from the opportunities offered. Partly for this reason, both Dallas and Cincinnati are allowing open admissions to some magnet and alternative schools. Cincinnati has no limitation on enrollment in its alternative high school program, except that applicants for the Performing Arts School audition to demonstrate a minimal amount of suitability for careers in the arts, and applicants for the college preparatory secondary school must score in the upper range on a special achievement test. Interest and motivation to attend are the primary criteria for admission in both districts, and attempts are being made to provide applicants with information and assistance to ensure wise career decisions both before and after entrance.

The majority of elementary themes stress student interest (e.g. bilingual studies) or are designed to help nearly all students who can be persuaded to attend (e.g. Individually Guided Education). Admissions are therefore a matter of self-selection. In some cases, however, definite entrance standards are established for admittance to elementary or middle-grade magnet programs. For example, Cincinnati's College Preparatory Program for students in grades four through six requires that students be achieving at a level sufficient to benefit from participation in the program. Decisions in this regard are made primarily by counselors, taking into account a variety of information including previous achievement, ability tests, student motivation, and teacher ratings. This type of requirement sometimes may be necessary in order to assure middle status parents or upwardly-mobile working class parents that their children really will receive a better education than is perceived to be available in local neighborhood schools.

The issue of whether magnet schools should be selective and elite is a new version of an old question: Should students be homogeneously grouped or "tracked" according to their ability and previous performance? Tracking students into identifiable programs is sometimes appropriate in education, as when some students in a high school are blocked into physics or chemistry classes in which the majority do not enroll. However, many years of research and hundreds of studies on homogeneous grouping have failed to demonstrate consistent benefits for either above or below average students, though grouping probably does simplify the job of teachers in schools with a wide range of abilities and performance levels. Other considerations being equal, homogeneous grouping is not desirable in racially integrated schools in which it may separate middle status whites into one class and economically disadvantaged minority students into another. Tracking students into somewhat selective magnet programs, on the other hand, sometimes may serve a desirable social purpose if this helps retain white and black middle class students in urban public schools.

Entrance standards and quotas to ensure racial integration frequently result in a situation in which many more black students are applying than can be admitted at the same time that criteria for admission are being relaxed or stretched to attract white students. While such a situation is undesirable from the point of view of equity, it may be defensible if part of a long-range district-wide plan for providing better educational opportunities and racially integrated experiences for all students. Use of entrance criteria may be desirable in some magnet programs as in Dallas and Cincinnati where they are part of a larger effort based primarily on open admissions policies.

### Full Time or Part Time Enrollment

Some magnet school programs are designed to enroll students for only a part of the school year or school day. Hous-

ton's magnet program in literature, for example, brings together elementary students from a number of adjoining schools for two weeks of study. A skilled staff of teachers provide specialized resources and curriculum to help develop greater understanding and appreciation of literature with multi-cultural and personal meaning for children. Cleveland's Supplementary Education Center provides two weeks a year of greatly enriched study in an integrated setting for middle-grade students from throughout the city. Two-thirds of the students attending the four magnet high schools in Dallas attend for half a day and spend the remainder of the day studying "regular" subjects in their "home" school.

In 1975-76, more than 6,000 students from Boston and its suburbs were enrolled in part-of-the-year magnet education programs conducted with special desegregation funds provided by the Massachusetts Department of Education. Table 3 lists the elements which Massachusetts Department of Education observers have found to be characteristic of successful part-time magnet programs.

Students in some cities traditionally have spent one or more weeks a year at learning centers providing instruction in various subjects such as nature study or science. When implemented as part of a desegregation effort, part-time elementary magnets are an elaboration on this tradition. One must be aware, however, that a few weeks of the school year do not constitute a substantial amount of racially or economically integrated schooling.

There are more difficult decisions involved at the high school level. Requiring half-day attendance at a highly specialized and expensive facility designed to give students advanced skills in the health sciences, for example, could mean that twice as many students would be accommodated in an attractive integrated setting as would be possible on a full-time basis. This type of policy also means that students can participate in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities in neighborhood high schools, thereby providing an inducement for enrollment on the part of students who prefer to attend local schools for athletics, music, or other special activities as well as basic academic subjects.

There are other students, however, who prefer to attend just one school. If they enter a magnet high school and wish to have regular academic subjects and extracurricular activities they should be available. To provide a satisfactory range of regular academic subjects and extracurricular activities requires sufficient students to justify the employment of qualified staff in each subject offered, thus in some

**Table 3**

## Elements of Successful Part-Time Magnet Education Programs Designed to Offer High Quality Integrated Schooling in Massachusetts

In evaluating the 1974-75 magnet education programs, the Massachusetts Department of Education Bureau of Equal Opportunities found a general pattern of common elements among the successful programs. Some preliminary hypotheses regarding the elements of the successful magnet educational program are as follows:

1. Programs with specific operational definitions of "racial/ethnic awareness and understanding" tend to be more successful.
2. Programs which teach learning processes such as observing, measuring, constructing, and problem solving are more successful than those which teach specific facts or information.
3. Programs are more successful in raising racial and ethnic awareness if carefully planned activities highlighting interdependence, cooperation, group accomplishment, and shared decision-making are used.
4. Programs are more successful if activities are planned to accommodate and interest students of differing abilities.
5. Programs located at a reputable cultural, recreational, or educational institution tend to be more attractive to students and parents and more successful at holding student interest.
6. Programs tend to be more successful if they take place mostly at a third site.
7. A program lasting six equivalent school days tends to have a larger impact on elementary and middle school students, while high school students appear to require a longer program.
8. Formative (on-going) evaluation measures which allow projects to assess objectives and accomplishments in progress are more important than summative (final) evaluation documents.

Several other recommendations appear to have validity, but it is not certain that the evidence of the first year supports them sufficiently:

9. Programs are more successful if regular school teachers are actively involved in the program's design and implementation.
10. Programs are more successful if the course content is coordinated with the regular school curriculum being taught before and after the magnet program.
11. Programs are more successful if parents are actively informed and involved in program development and implementation.
12. Student selection should be voluntary on a first-come, first-served basis.

**Source:** Charles McMillan and Judith Boroschek, "Elements of Successful Progress," *Schools and Programs of Choice: Voluntary Desegregation in Massachusetts*. Boston, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Department of Education Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity, April 1977.

magnets it may be desirable to require full-time enrollment.

This decision should be made on a flexible basis depending on the unique conditions which exist at a particular period of time in a given school district. During the first phases of a magnet school plan, policies probably should allow for part-time enrollment with emphasis on attracting as many students as possible into integrated magnet schools.

Emphasis at this stage should be placed on making the magnet programs as attractive as possible, and demonstrating the benefits of forsaking the convenience and security of local high schools for a better educational experience for part of the school day. This has been the approach followed in Dallas, where career opportunities and facilities not available in high schools anywhere else are available in the magnet schools. In Performing Arts, for example, students have three rehearsal facilities, dressing rooms, and modern stage lights, and they study under the direction and tutelage of acknowledged leaders from the region's theatrical profession. Many more students applied for admission than could be enrolled during the first year.

The Business and Management Magnet School, similarly, has equipment far more advanced than is available in regular high schools. Students develop their skills using the latest equipment, working as much as possible on "real" assignments (preparing inventories, mailings, etc.) performed for the central office and other schools in the district. Nearly all the instruction is individualized and is provided by teachers with recent experience in the field. In their senior year students are placed in appropriate supervised internships paying anywhere from the minimum wage to $5 or $6 per hour—300 students were placed in internships by April of 1977. The program seems to be succeeding in providing minority students with much better business skills than they have acquired at local high schools in the past. Dallas officials hope this demonstration of excellence will attract more white students and stimulate more students to prepare for professional careers in business and management.

## Location and Size

Many considerations enter into decisions about the number of magnet schools to be opened, the sites at which to locate them, and the number of students they will enroll. Distances to be traveled, adequacy of facilities, the nature of the magnet curricula, potential for recruitment, racial and econimic balance, and other factors all should play a part in determining the location and size of magnet schools.

At the elementary level, there is a clear advantage in locating a particular program at several sites within a fairly large school district. In general, elementary magnets do not utilize expensive equipment and facilities; hence there is not much need to locate them centrally in order to provide a large population base for efficient utilization. In addition, most parents are unwilling to send elementary-age children long distances to attend school.

Secondary magnet schools, however, often utilize costly physical facilities which must be fully utilized by serving as many students from throughout a district as can be persuaded to attend and accommodated in the magnet schools. After observing the early development of Dallas' magnet high schools, Francis S. Chase and Marjorie H. Buchanan recommended that decisionmakers consider setting minimum enrollment figures for existing and proposed magnet schools. "Enrollment below 500," they pointed out, "may make it difficult to offer a full range of appropriate programs without excessive per capita cost." To obtain sufficient minimum enrollment, magnet secondary schools in Dallas and other cities tend to be located in or near the downtown area where they are easily accessible from all parts of a district.

There are some situations, however, where it is appropriate to locate magnet schools at outlying sites, even at the secondary level. For example, such a decision may be advantageous when a site between white and black neighborhoods can help attain stable racial balance, when an existing school's facilities or programs are particularly suitable, or when locating near an urban renewal or conservation area could help stabilize deteriorating neighborhoods or contribute to the rebuilding of communities on a racially and economically integrated basis.

Magnet programs which include only a fraction of the students within a magnet school and thus constitute a "school within a school" for these students represent one approach to educational options. The Petrochemical Career Institute and the Vanguard magnet programs in Houston, and the Junior High College alternative program in Cincinnati are examples of "school within a school" magnets. Advantages of this approach include increasing access to more families, the possibility of having magnet students attend some classes with non-magnet students (partly to reduce the dangers of elitism), and the chance to draw on magnet program resources (science equipment, specialized staff) to enrich curriculum in regular classes. Disadvantages involve the possibility that magnet students will be viewed or will view themselves as a privileged elite group within the school, and the possibility that parents may be reluctant to place their children in magnet classes in a school perceived as "typically" inner city in socioeconomic character.

One problem which has emerged in large school districts attempting to establish a wide range of educational options is the tendency to concentrate magnet schools in neighborhoods which have been undergoing racial and/or economic transition. Many of these neighborhoods surround the downtown area but many others are at one end or another of the district. Because parents in these communities frequently have become or are becoming negative about local public schools, and because these neighborhoods often are relatively well situated to draw a racially and economically mixed enrollment, it is logical to place attractive new magnet programs in them. However, if a single magnet in a particular subject is placed at one end of the city, or if two or three magnets in another subject are located in fairly close proximity, opportunities for recruiting students from other parts of the district may be severely inhibited and transportation costs for those who are recruited from distant neighborhoods may become nearly prohibitive.

All these considerations suggest that the location and size of magnet school programs as well as the nature of their curricula should be part of a long-range plan for providing options in the school district as a whole. Ambitious magnet plans necessarily must be implemented in phases, with sufficient time allowed for careful implementation of each program and for building on experience in the early years. Attention should be given from the start to how large each magnet program eventually might become, and where each should be located in relation to others as part of an overall plan to make suitable alternatives available for all students in a district.

## LEARNING STYLES AND MAGNET SCHOOLS

Many magnet school programs place relatively little emphasis on determining whether students are selecting programs that are most suitable for them academically and intellectually. Instead, nearly the entire emphasis frequently appears to be on providing options—options that parents and students may elect to pursue, whether appropriate or inappropriate. There is much to be said for enlarging options in schools and for allowing clients to make decisions. However, parents and students must receive enough information and guidance to make wise decisions.

Students bring a wide variety of attitudes, perceptions, and learning preferences to school and the academic process. Learning styles reflect the manner in which pupils organize their environment and deal attentively with the process of perceiving, thinking, and solving problems. For example, some students learn best by reading textbooks and answering questions on material they have read, but others learn more rapidly and thoroughly by working independently with a variety of auditory and visual materials. There is a growing recognition that learning style and the influence it appears to exert on a student's academic progress must be considered more closely in designing educational programs and curricula.

Alternative or magnet schools presently have an opportunity to accommodate individual learning differences to a greater degree than usually has been offered in traditional education. Yet magnet schools sometimes may place students in programs which fail to take account of individual learning styles.

Possibly the most important strategy in accommodating learning styles involves the amount of structure necessary for the individual student. Allowing students who need structure to enroll in magnet programs that are unstructured and depend on student self direction may result in disruption and chaos. Magnet school staff must be careful to avoid producing environmental disorganization.

On the other hand, the reflective, independent student preferring discovery approaches to learning may find too much structured guidance inappropriate for the development of critical thoughtfulness. An independent learner who prefers individual rather than group effort may perform better when group instruction is infrequent and there is little teacher direction. Parents of such children who place them in teacher centered fundamental school classrooms are likely to inhibit their academic development.

In order to successfully match students with magnet programs, it is imperative to offer a diversity of instructional approaches in addition to new subject matter. An emphasis on the appropriateness of specific instruction for each pupil can help make magnet labels more meaningful and reduce simplistic expectations that parents, students, and school personnel might have.

Providing instruction appropriate to students' learning styles is more likely to happen when staff members work together to diagnose learning problems and prescribe learning experiences in line with each student's current state of readiness. Cincinnati's Burton College Preparatory Program (grades 4, 5, 6) has altered previous entrance requirements to include children of average achievement and ability. Successful adaptation of the program to a wider range of learning styles, skills, and socioeconomic levels has depended on teacher cooperation and organization, differentiated subprograms, and ability-based instruction. "We work with the child not so much for college at this point," one administrator commented, "but for the next step he is ready to take."

Even with the most flexible curriculum and instructors, student or parent selection of alternative programs may result in inappropriate placement for children who have a history of maladaptation, learning disabilities, or difficulty with motivation. Parents should be informed that magnet schools organized around one instructional approach or another will not "cure" deepseated educational or emotional difficulties.

To summarize, the magnet school movement recognizes that students differ in learning needs which can be addressed in diversified learning environments. Parents should be adequately apprised of the program characteristics that may be most suitable for their children. Otherwise, alternative programs providing options in education may place children in magnet schools which are inappropriate or even harmful for their subsequent academic development.

## ROLE OF CIVIC LEADERSHIP AND CITIZENS

One of the most important and intriguing developments which has occurred in connection with the magnet school movement is that civic leadership—particularly business leaders—and concerned citizens have joined forces with educators to improve the quality of education in public schools. Developments in Dallas and Cincinnati are particularly impressive, and illustrate the contribution this participation can make to magnet school goals.

Active civic participation in Dallas began in connection with the district's court-ordered desegregation plan, though its thrust has been most notable in connection with the magnet schools. In several respects, the magnet school effort is inseparable from the "Keep It Together Dallas" campaign, spearheaded by the Chamber of Commerce and the Dallas Citizens Alliance. Civic leaders working with the Superintendent of Schools, Nolan Estes, helped write the desegregation plan which, to a large degree, was accepted and ordered by the United States District Court for Dallas. (That plan is on appeal by the NAACP before the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.) Business leaders were particularly concerned about the magnet school component. They recognized the key role they could play in attracting students and establishing out-

standing programs, and they felt the magnets were particularly important to the future of the city. Many also felt that the established programs at Skyline Center were outstanding but too selective and school-centered; magnet schools could help provide more students with up-to-date skills in a setting conducive to their acquisition and application.

Examples of the efforts which have resulted from collaboration between civic leaders and the Dallas Schools have included the following:

- Top Dallas leaders are serving on task forces which help plan and organize each magnet school. For example, the chairman of the Health Professions Magnet School Task Force is Boone Powell, administrator of Baylor Medical Center. John Murchison of Diversified Instruments is task force chairman of the Arts Magnet and Lee Turner of Texas Utilities chairs the Business and Management Center Task Force. Involvement of civic leaders at this level helps to ensure that planning for the magnets is consonant with job opportunities in the Dallas region and that the schools will be able to draw on the best available resources in designing and implementing instructional programs. For example, more than 100 of the largest business and industrial firms in the Dallas region are working in one way or another with the Business-Management Center to develop and implement outstanding curricula in careers being pursued by students at this magnet.

- Highly respected community leaders are serving as directors of the magnet schools. For example, the director of the Arts Magnet is Dr. Paul Baker, who directs the Dallas Theatre Center and is Dean of the Trinity Graduate School of Arts. During the 1976-77 school year outstanding leaders from appropriate businesses on loan to the public schools directed the other three magnet schools. This arrangement helps to ensure that problems which surface in establishing the new programs are quickly and continuously attended to by school and civic leaders in Dallas.

- The Chamber of Commerce employs a full-time professional and his staff to work on development of the magnet schools and other aspects of career education in the Dallas Public Schools. The Chamber sent a large volume of literature describing the desegregation plan and the needs of the Dallas schools in general to more than 700 companies during the Spring and Summer of 1976. The Chamber also sends out a monthly update on developments in the Dallas schools to 8,000 recipients who receive its regular report to members.

- Business and philanthropic leaders made more than $100,000 available for magnet school recruiting and helped in other ways to attract students to the magnet schools. For example, they helped secure agreement for simultaneous broadcasting at 6 p.m. on all Dallas TV stations of a one hour professionally-produced film about the magnets and the desegregation plan. Partly as a result of these efforts, 5,550 applications were received for the 2,000 to 2,500 openings originally planned for the four magnet high schools, and the school district was able to enroll 3,835 students in the four schools when they opened in the Fall of 1976-77.

- As a result of the initiative and coordination of the Chamber of Commerce, by the Fall of 1977 150 schools in Dallas were receiving help from approximately 600 businesses as well as other outside organizations. Much of this assistance was provided through the Adopt-A-School program initiated in connection with the desegregation plan. Organizations which provide assistance at specific schools as part of this program include businesses, civic organizations, church groups, and social service agencies. Assistance offered ranges from sharing resources and funding for supplies, curriculum materials, and transportation to provision of work and field experience sites, in-school speakers, "big brother" and "big sister" participants, and advisory services from executives on loan from major corporations.

As part of a larger effort to focus community-wide attention and services on improving the public schools, the Chamber also helped establish a Coordinating Network of community groups which includes PTAs, school advisory committees, higher education institutions, youth groups, and realtors working for the success of the desegregation plan. The close cooperation which has developed between so many organizations and the public schools represents an effort to share responsibility for the education of students in Dallas.

As in Dallas, Cincinnati emphasizes citizen involvement in working to ensure the success of its alternative schools program. Citizen participation is concentrated in long-range planning task forces staffed by personnel from the central office. In addition to a task force on Alternative Schools, three other task forces deal respectively with systemwide considerations involving Basic Instruction, Facilities, and Support Services. Representatives from these four groups serve on a steering committee which works closely with the central administration and the board of education in planning for improvements in the quality of education throughout the district. School officials in Cincinnati feel that the task forces are helping not only to pinpoint changes needed to make reform efforts successful but also to build the support necessary to put them into practice.

The Alternative School Task Force is particularly concerned about ensuring that development of the alternative program is not carried out at the expense of regular neighborhood schools, and that parents of children in non-alternative programs do not perceive the alternatives as inequitably siphoning off too many resources from their local schools. One way to minimize these potential problems is to ensure that each group understands the interests of the other and supports efforts to upgrade all the schools in the district—not just the school one's own child happens to attend. Both groups must become aware of what is needed to improve education in urban schools and then must work for efficient and economical implementation of all new reform efforts.

Dallas and Cincinnati exemplify ways in which civic leadership and citizen participation can enhance the educational improvement efforts carried out largely or partly through magnet or alternative school programming. This is a critical component in providing better educational opportunities for economically disadvantaged students in the inner city as well as middle status students elsewhere in the metropolitan area.

# ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

Although magnet school education tends to be uniquely shaped by the diverse community and legal conditions in each school district, there are a number of characteristics which are common to successful magnet programs. Vigorous leadership, intensely focused planning efforts by knowledgeable personnel, sufficient planning time, and high-powered, comprehensive recruiting efforts are commonly required to ensure the success of a budding magnet program.

## Leadership

Magnet school programs are most likely to succeed if they are strongly supported in a school district—generally by the Superintendent of Schools and other high level central office personnel. The importance of top management support may seem self-evident, but many highly publicized and outwardly impressive urban education programs have failed partly because the backing of top management consisted only of a formal endorsement followed by neglect.

Much of the success of the magnet program in Houston, for example, can be attributed to the initiative of the General Superintendent of Schools and to assistant and area superintendents who have consistently demonstrated active commitment to the project. Administrators at this level have been responsible for releasing personnel to work on magnet school programming, for obtaining sufficient resources to establish the magnets, and for gaining community support for the project as a whole. They have helped especially in persuading principals in the non-magnet schools not to subvert the recruitment of students for magnet programs and have provided central office assistance in communicating with potential students.

Similarly in Cincinnati, Dallas, and Minneapolis, top school district administrators have played a very active part in conceiving and establishing the magnet programs. Cincinnati Superintendents of Schools Donald Waldrip and James N. Jacobs have made alternative schools a fundamental part of long-range planning for that district. Dallas Superintendent Nolan Estes not only has worked closely with business and civic leadership in drawing up the magnet program there, but has made it clear to all school district personnel that he expects them to support it in practice.

## Sufficient Planning Time

Pressures for immediate action to desegregate or to reduce white or middle class withdrawal from the public schools make it tempting to quickly initiate a magnet school program. However, a successful magnet program often requires a new instructional program, selection and preparation of teachers, recruiting students, and establishing relations with community institutions; things that take time.

In Houston, approximately five months elapsed between the appointment of the administrative team and the opening of the magnet school program in the Fall of 1975. Although the magnet schools in Houston constitute a small fraction of the schools and only a few thousand students were involved, fundamental changes in instructional arrangements were needed in some of the participating schools. The Houston schools had already completed a major needs analysis for each school where principals worked closely with communities to identify goals and programs for their schools. If this assessment had not already been done, and if the plan had involved an integration effort affecting a majority of the district's pupils, five months would not have been sufficient time to plan.

Six months were available for planning the magnet program in St. Louis. Since the plan was not approved by the court until June, 1976, student recruitment for the following fall was not completed until after that time. According to Samuel Miller, executive director of the program, "If we had done all of our student recruitment during the school year . . . our job would have been a lot easier." One result of the compressed recruitment period was that the magnet schools opened with a 70 percent black enrollment instead of the 50 percent black enrollment level that was planned.

The time required to carry out all of the elements of a well developed magnet program varies with the size of the program and the situation in a particular school district. We believe, however, that the planning of a magnet program for several thousand students generally requires at least nine or ten months of intensive planning.

## Focused Planning

Houston's 16-member Administrative Team deserves much of the credit for the success of Houston's magnet school program. Team members, school district personnel representing various administrative levels within the Houston Public Schools, were granted high priority in allotment of materials, secretarial assistance, and rented office space isolated from the daily distractions of their regular duties to plan for the magnets. The team's objective was to design the program so that it would ultimately be carried out through normal administrative channels.

In implementing the magnet school program, the Administrative Team gave every principal a list of magnet programs proposed by a community task force. The principals requested magnet programs after they had discussed the task force list with staff, parents, and community organizations, and had compiled an extensive needs assessment survey submitted from their school. A considerable amount of the Team's time was spent in selecting appropriate schools and personnel for the magnet programs. Team members were knowledgeable about personnel and conditions throughout the district and could determine whether magnet concepts might work well in a given school. They were also in a position to identify building principals who could provide the leadership needed to recruit students and faculty, to coordinate schedules, and to solve other problems associated with a new magnet program. Programs were placed in schools with grassroots support, and the physical environment and leadership needed to implement the program.

While Houston's administrative team is only one of the planning approaches which might be followed in establishing a magnet program, it is a good example of the focus of leadership and control necessary to develop creative alternative programs. This focus is needed not only so that critical decisions can be made decisively in a short period of time, but for continuity and a smooth transition into expanded magnet programs in the future. Districts whose leadership is ineffectual and diffuse will have difficulty establishing and maintaining the commitments necessary in making a long range, permanent magnet program work.

# MAGNET SCHOOLS AND RACIAL INTEGRATION

An important goal of many magnet school programs is to eliminate or reduce the number of predominantly one-race schools. No universally accepted standards exist to define when a school is no longer racially segregated. For this reason school officials sometimes have considerable leeway in planning to meet racial balance goals through magnet schools and in deciding whether these programs are moving far and fast enough.

Elementary magnet schools in small school districts clearly can help to eliminate racial isolation. If, for example, a district has ten elementary schools and two of them are racially segregated (predominantly white or predominantly minority), converting these two into magnet schools can make them integrated if students of the opposite race can be persuaded to enroll.

In Houston the magnet school program was initiated voluntarily following the failure of court-ordered arrangements for the pairing of schools—arrangements that clearly had been increasing rather than reducing segregation. In Cincinnati school officials initiated the alternative program two years prior to the filing of the desegregation suit and expanded efforts more rapidly as a result of the suit. In Dallas, Milwaukee, and St. Louis magnet school programs are being developed more directly in response to court cases involving desegregation. School officials interested in achieving desegregation through magnet schools should initiate such a program well in advance of external pressure from the courts and the federal government. Otherwise they may lack the time needed for careful development of a program.

The effectiveness of magnet programs for eliminating segregation is unclear. Since desegregation goals vary from district to district, and since many other factors influence the degree of segregation in a given area, it is difficult to isolate the effectiveness of magnet schools as techniques for desegregating schools. The data on the racial composition of enrollments in magnet programs in Houston and Cincinnati provide some preliminary indication of the effects such programs can have on school integration in large districts.

Houston officials have pointed out that the magnet school program was not a plan for the racial integration of the district as a whole. The major desegregation goal, to be achieved by 1977, was to reduce by thirteen the number of schools that had minority or non-minority populations of 90 percent or more. During the 1975-76 school year thirty-four magnet school programs were established and 587 minority students (black and brown) and 670 white students transferred into magnet schools with enrollments between 25 and 75 percent minority during the previous year. All together, approximately 5,400 students from a total district enrollment of about 207,000 had transferred into magnet programs as of September, 1976. While some of these transfers probably are attributable to white withdrawal from low-status minority schools, they nevertheless represent gains in integration as compared with the situation that developed in the original plan for paired schools. However, only four schools became less than 90 percent minority or non-minority in 1975-76 as a direct result of the magnet program—less than half the number Houston officials had hoped to achieve through magnetization, and 125 of the district's 233 schools were still segregated in 1977 by this definition.

It should be noted also that many of the magnet programs being developed in Houston provide for only limited contact between pupils of differing racial and ethnic backgrounds. At the elementary level, for example, students in the cluster magnet schools join students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds for only one week a year, a limited opportunity to reduce racial isolation.

The pattern in Cincinnati appears to be somewhat similar to that in Houston. Many of the magnet programs have a good balance of minority and non-minority students, often approaching a 50-50 ratio, and many of the students in these programs previously were in schools that were either predominantly white or predominantly minority. White enrollment declined at a slightly slower rate after the alternative program was expanded, (in 1975 and 1976) than in the preceding three years. Even more encouraging, the Taueber segregation index, which indicates the percentage of students of one race who would have to transfer in order to achieve a racial balance in each school reflecting the district racial balance as a whole, has declined since the alternative programs were expanded in 1974. The index for 1976-77 was the lowest it has been since 1963.

On the other hand, only three of 52 schools which were half or more black in 1974-75 (out of a district total of 99 schools) had a reduction in the percentage of black pupils of five percent or more when the alternative program was expanded in 1975-76. Cincinnati, like Houston, still has a long way to go in reducing racial isolation.

Experience in Dallas, Milwaukee, and other cities which are establishing magnet schools as an integral part of a larger court-ordered desegregation plan also indicates that a magnet program does not provide a complete solution to the problem of white withdrawal from big cities and their public schools. In Dallas, for example, although approximately 1,300 white students were enrolled in integrated magnet-type schools in 1976-1977, white enrollment in the Dallas Public Schools fell by 11 percent (from 59,582 to 53,008) between 1975 and 1976. Comparable declines of ten percent and eight percent occurred respectively between 1974 and 1975 and between 1973 and 1974. It is not possible to determine precisely how much of this decline has been due to imminent or actual desegregation, to "natural" suburbanization and lower birth rates, or to a combination of these and other possible causes. It is probable that the 1975 to 1976 decline in white enrollment would have been greater in the absence of magnet alternatives.

In Milwaukee, a desegregation plan implemented in the Fall of 1976 resulted in the assignment of 17,496 students outside of their neighborhood attendance areas to meet court standards calling for 25 to 45 percent black enrollment in the public schools. Approximately 6,600 students out of nearly 110,000 in the district were transported as part of the plan, and 3,430 students (47 percent black) enrolled outside of their neighborhoods in "specialty" or magnet schools designed to bring about racial balance voluntarily. Initiation of the desegregation plan increased the number of schools meeting the 25-45 percent standard from 15 in May, 1976, to 67 in September, 1976, but white enrollment declined by 5.5 percent as compared with 2.4 percent between 1974 and 1975 and 3.9 percent between 1973 and 1974.

In Boston, similarly, 22 of 154 schools are organized in a city-wide magnet school district which in 1976-77 enrolled approximately 13,300 students including about 6,700 white students. However, white enrollment in the Boston Public Schools as a whole declined by 30 percent (from 32,951 to 23,176) between 1974 and 1976. Clearly, the magnet component assisted in bringing about appreciable desegregation in both Milwaukee and Boston, but it remains to be seen how stable this desegregation will be in the absence of metropolitan-wide remedies for segregation in large districts like Milwaukee (43 percent minority in 1976), Boston (57 percent minority), and Dallas (62 percent minority) which already have a high proportion of minority students enrolled.

Magnet schools bring white and minority students together in a setting that encourages positive intergroup attitudes. Amir's review of the research on inter-group contact (Amir, 1969) concludes that contact tends to be most constructive when there is "equal status contact between members of the various ethnic groups" and "the members of *both* groups in the particular contact situation interact in functionally important activities" that involve the pursuit of common goals. In many cases magnet schools may do more than "regular" schools to provide or ensure this type of contact because certain magnet programs tend to:

- provide a means for cooperative study of topics in which students of various racial groups have indicated a common interest. Good examples of such topics are the performing arts and foreign language study.
- broaden the range of subjects which are studied in depth in the public schools, in so doing lessening the likelihood that previously low-achieving minority students will generally be placed in a low status situation in a classroom limited largely to traditional academic subject matter and methods.
- offer individualized courses of study and instruction in activities which reduce the importance of existing status differences among various groups of participating students. For example, magnet schools emphasizing individually guided instruction or continuous progress help students proceed at their own rate without magnifying the fact that some groups may be very low in initial achievement. This may contribute to positive interracial contact in addition to providing superior educational opportunities for all students.
- provide opportunities for accelerated academic progress by students who otherwise would be attending inner city schools.

## Recruitment

Without the ability to recruit diverse students representing a cross section of talent, multiethnic backgrounds and socioeconomic status, magnet school programs may end up as elitist alternative education at best or merely another form of compensatory training at worst.

Perhaps the most priceless commodity in recruiting magnet students is time. Recruitment for a magnet program can be difficult since potential students must be notified and persuaded to attend, admission information must be reviewed, and students sometimes must be selected at least partly in accordance with specific goals for racial composition and city-wide enrollment origins. Cities like Houston and St. Louis which have been caught in time squeezes due to court suits have had to do most of their first-year recruiting during the summer without the opportunity to use the schools as bases of operation. This generally allows only a short time for curriculum directors in the schools to make final class tallies and to develop an optimal master schedule. For example, when Chicago's Whitney Young Magnet High School began initial enrollment in July before the 1975 Fall opening, the staff had only two weeks to accomplish what officials considered to be a six month coordinating and programming job. Conversely, a longer lead time gives school districts a chance to train counselors and recruiters, overcome public resistance to change, and generally eliminate first year chaos that might adversely affect long-range public perceptions of the program.

Magnet school recruitment personnel in Cincinnati, Dallas, and other cities are finding that well organized publicity campaigns, information hotlines, public meetings and favorable stories in the mass media help motivate parents and students in deciding that the possible inconvenience of changing schools is worth the effort. In Cincinnati, business leaders and the schools cooperated to recruit students. An attractive, wallet-style packet describing the programs was sent home to parents, replete with application blanks and sources to contact for additional information. The Houston school district furnishes transportation from the central office to magnet school sites for interested parents who may want to visit one or more programs before enrolling their children. In both Cincinnati and Milwaukee separate sections in major commercial newspapers have provided detailed accounts of the magnet programs. Student recruitment campaigns also were conducted on radio and television. Without these unusually intensive and comprehensive publicity efforts, neither city would have come close to reaching its student recruitment goals, particularly with respect to attracting white students to schools with a high proportion of minority students.

Beyond knowledge of the magnet program itself, families want assurance of safe and reliable transportation, a balanced curriculum ensuring adequate college preparatory courses in the secondary schools and the basic skills at the elementary level, program stability to guarantee educational continuity and a sense of security for the students, and genuinely different educational concepts or approaches from the closer neighborhood schools. Seattle arranged for a survey of student and parent preferences for educational options to identity patron choices and help develop district priorities. Several magnet schools and programs in Cincinnati, such as the Burton College Preparatory Academy and the Linwood Fundamental School, have found that the publicity and incentives of magnets often draw students whose parents later enroll other siblings if they find that magnet opportunities match their publicity releases. Initially student recruitment depends on a school and media blitz of information and a range of strategically located program choices, but the availability of attractive educational opportunities carefully developed and successfully implemented over a period of one or more years determines if students stay and others follow.

One of the major obstacles to magnet school recruiting is the tendency for regular school staff to subvert magnet student enrollment. Many principals may see magnet schools as a threat to keeping their student population stable or may be fearful that their top leaders and achievers will be siphoned off. This problem can be particularly difficult, because the most vigorous and outstanding regular school administrators tend to be particularly concerned

about losing their best teachers and students. Teachers in regular schools also may resent magnet competitors which have smaller classes and more funds for equipment and materials. To some degree, top management action can discourage or contain this resentment. Dallas Superintendent Nolan Estes established a seven-member task force to study reports of resistance to the magnet programs by regular Dallas schools. Dallas recruiters now stress the benefits of the magnet schools to the district as a whole and the importance of students making wise choices as individuals.

## COSTS AND TRANSPORTATION

It is difficult to discuss the costs of a school district magnet program without consideration of the variety of programs offered, their start up costs as compared to ongoing expenditures, and the number of students served by the magnet resources. Some magnet programs, especially at the elementary level, entail little more than a reorganization of school objectives or teaching procedures and have very few, if any, additional costs. A concentration of programs at the secondary level, on the other hand, often involves specialists and expensive equipment or materials such as sophisticated science labs for medical or science magnets and modern stage accommodations for performing arts schools.

An example of a district with a wide range of magnet costs is Cincinnati, which invested $1,668,697 above normal operational expenditures in alternative and magnet programs for the 1975-76 school year. This was an additional average per pupil expenditure of $312, with a low excess cost per pupil of $19 for the Elementary College Preparatory program and a high of $954 for the Cincinnati Academy for Math and Science at the secondary level. Among the thirteen programs in 1975-1976, five cost less than $100 above the district's average per pupil expenditure, and three kept costs below $200 when transportation was excluded.

Other cities such as Houston and St. Louis have faced greater initial start up costs than those in Cincinnati where the program was developed more gradually over a number of years. Houston officials projected that the cost of the district's Phase I and II magnet program between 1975 and 1977 would be over $7.5 million of which the total local cost was estimated at approximately $5 million. Included in this figure are staff development, individual program budgets, and transportation costs. Actual costs for implementing the first 32 programs during Phase I in 1975-76 amounted to $4.2 million according to January 1976 estimates. Comparable amounts were allocated in St. Louis where the magnet program was budgeted at approximately $7 million for a maximum of 3,820 students for the 1976-77 school year. This is roughly double the average per pupil expenditure for that number of students in other St. Louis public schools. In Chicago, $21 million was initially spent to build the highly-specialized facility for Whitney Young Magnet High School, which is designed to enroll approximately 2,000 students in science, medical, and performing arts programs.

In some cities costs are almost impossible to estimate. In Boston, the magnet school programs are being developed with considerable assistance from higher education institutions and business, much of which is difficult to define in dollars and cents. Dallas has relied extensively on the business community which developed the concept of career centers as magnets and has donated equipment, leadership, volunteers, planning time and internships for the magnet schools. Even in cities where costs have been pinned down more concretely, it is difficult to separate magnet expenditures on items such as staff development from general expenditures in schools in which magnet students are only a part of the student body. For example, in Houston's Wainright Elementary School, all children, whether enrolled in the school's science magnet or not, receive improved science instruction in the new $7,000 magnet laboratory staffed by specialized science instructors. A similar situation exists in regular schools which house music academies, ecology centers, and cluster centers such as the Children's Literature Center in Briargrove Elementary School where video equipment rarely found in any public school can be used by the regular staff and students.

Perhaps the greatest ongoing budgetary strain of most district magnet programs is the cost of transportation. While this cost is minimal for some programs such as the Dallas secondary magnet schools which have been centrally located partially to take advantage of public transportation, several cities have found transportation expenses and organization to be major problems.

In Houston, for example, the school district covers a very large geographic area, and 1975-1976 transportation costs due to the magnet program were estimated at more than $1 million. Estimated additional service costs for the following year more than doubled this amount, thus pushing the total two-year magnet school transportation costs to a figure over $3 million. Some of the expenditures included in Houston's transportation costs included extra pay for drivers involved in multi-trip routing, overtime pay for office and shop personnel for extended day and weekend work, increased numbers of maintenance personnel, greater fuel and repair costs, and the exchange of inefficient large buses for new vans. These kinds of costs tend to fluctuate somewhat in accordance with changes in enrollment and in placement of magnet sites. During the first semester of Houston's magnet programs, many of the over 200 bus routes were being changed daily to accommodate students transferring in to magnet schools and to avoid segregated routing.

While Cincinnati contracts school bus transportation rather than maintaining its own system, it has run into similar problems involving awkward cross-town bus routes and other costs relating to magnet site distribution. Cincinnati presently spends between $700,000 to $800,000 in bus costs for 3,000 magnet program pupils; in isolated cases the district also pays cab fare for those students whom it is impractical to include in a regular route. School officials there believe that these costs could be reduced if the city were divided into geographical areas in which magnet programs were systematically distributed to facilitate more efficient bus routes. Location of programs according to population density would help lower costs, but other district goals relating to desegregation and neighborhood stabilization may thereby be jeopardized.

Other possibilities for minimizing transportation costs include the use of computer based bus scheduling, double

routing of buses, and staggered starting and dismissal times. Cincinnati found that its Computer Assisted Bus Scheduling System (CABS) contributed to a $400,000 savings during the 1976-77 school year. Approximately forty buses were eliminated from alternative and magnet routes by using CABS to organize double routing and differentiated scheduling in schools.

For many districts the question is not whether it is desirable to fund magnet schools, rather, it is how to fund them. In Dallas, $16 million of a recent $80 million school bond issue was earmarked exclusively for the district's magnet programs. This is not a dependable source since few school districts these days are able to pass bond issues of any magnitude. Besides federal funds to help in desegregation and state payments for transportation, additional money is available in a few states to support magnet programs or magnet-type transfers. For example, in Massachusetts the state legislature has provided financial incentives to encourage interdistrict transfers. Senator John Glenn of Ohio introduced federal legislation to provide magnet schools with aid up to $50 million for program planning, development, and maintenance.

Part of the difficulty in planning or isolating costs and funding for magnets is that programs cannot be totally isolated from the larger plan for quality education and school desegregation. In developing financial guidelines for magnet school funding consideration must be given to all the pupils in the district. In Cincinnati, the Citizens' Alternative School Task Force has developed a series of budgetary recommendations for alternative programs. These include an emphasis on programs which do not exceed average per pupil costs, evaluation and elimination of programs on a cost effectiveness basis, and equal percentage budgetary cuts for both regular and magnet schools when necessary. In other words, the goals and financing of the magnet programs should not overshadow those of the district at large. Magnet costs should not stand completely apart from the larger framework of district priorities for upgrading the quality of curriculum and instruction in all of a district's schools.

## DANGERS AND PITFALLS

Magnet school programs offer a great deal of potential for improving urban schools but they also may detract from the overall quality of education unless care is taken to avoid several pitfalls which are likely to arise in carrying them out. Two of these dangers are described below.

One of the most immediate dangers in implementing a magnet school program is that it will further damage the quality of instruction in inner city schools by skimming off or "creaming" the best students and teachers, leaving these schools even more devoid of positive academic leadership than they were in the first place.

From some points of view, magnet schools which attract substantial numbers of students from inner city neighborhoods can be viewed as providing new versions of old "tracking" approaches for highly motivated students from upwardly-mobile, low-status families. Magnet schools similarly give middle class white and minority students who live in or next to the inner city a chance to attend classes which provide better educational opportunities than usually are available in typical inner city classrooms. Because desegregation guidelines militate against separate tracking of white students in desegregated schools, and because too few middle-class minority students may be available to economically constitute a separate high-achieving track, big city school district officials have been hard pressed to provide adequate instructional opportunities for many high achieving and/or highly motivated students until the advent of the magnet school movement.

The logic of this development suggests that a delicate balance needs to be reached between the goals of improving opportunity for high achieving or highly motivated students and not decimating inner city schools by draining off their best students and teachers.

Earlier in this essay we indicated that most magnet school programs require additional physical resources as well as time and attention to establish and operate. While these resources tend to be relatively small after the initial start-up phase, it is possible that time and money invested in magnets will reduce or limit resources available to "regular" public schools. Many magnet schools are justifying this investment because it contributes to important educational goals such as instructional improvement, racial integration, and expansion of choices available to public school clients.

We are not convinced, however, that magnet schools will help bring about much long-range improvement in urban schools unless they are part of a systematic and far-reaching program for improving instruction on a school-by-school basis throughout an entire school district. If magnet school planning results in the diversion of too many physical and human resources from other school improvement efforts, inner city schools will continue to be deficient in teaching and learning, middle status schools frequently will continue to be too uniform and standardized, and middle class parents will continue to withdraw their children from floundering urban school districts.

School officials in cities where magnet programs have been established seem to be aware of this problem. In Cincinnati, for example, Superintendent of Schools James N. Jacobs has stated that "steps must be taken to strengthen neighborhood schools at the same time the alternative program is being initiated and expanded." Cincinnati school officials accordingly launched a $2.5 million dollar city-wide reading program during the first full year (1975-76) of the alternative school program and is conducting a sizeable three-year research project to improve reading instruction at the elementary level. In Dallas, similarly, a million dollar career education project for a group of inner city schools was initiated simultaneously with the implementation of the desegregation plan and the magnet schools program.

Both Dallas and Boston are drawing heavily on business and other community resources to improve educational opportunities on a district-wide basis, not just in the magnet schools. Dallas, Boston, Cincinnati, and Milwaukee have organized citizen committees to help make long-range plans partly to ensure that magnet programming is not carried out at the expense of regular neighborhood schools. Experience in these cities suggests that a meaningful magnet or alternative school program can be undertaken while moving to bring about substantial improvements in all public schools.

## CONCLUSION

Magnet schools can be viewed in two contrasting lights, one focusing on the distinguishing characteristics which define a magnet school and the other focusing on the role of magnet schools as part of a larger effort to improve the quality of education in urban school districts.

Emphasizing the first point of view, magnet schools offer a special program of instruction designed to attract students from a wider area than the community in which it is located. They make more alternatives available for students, reduce racial and economic segregation, and can serve as the basis for instructional reform. Interested and enthusiastic faculty and students benefit from the opportunity to work together to achieve the goals of quality education. Students in attendance may be better educated than would have been true at their local neighborhood school, particularly if they live in predominantly low income, inner city communities.

Magnet schools are a positive approach to public education. However a few isolated or detached magnet schools are not likely to have much impact on the quality of education available throughout an urban public school district. A few schools are not sufficient to address economic and racial segregation, withdrawal of middle-class families, and unproductive standardization in curriculum and instruction. Magnet schools can be an important component in efforts to address these problems, but they are only a part of the district-wide plan that is needed to improve instruction and combat racial and economic segregation. Drawing systematically on civic and community resources and leadership can place magnet school programs in perspective as part of a larger effort at urban school reform. Lacking this broader perspective and effort, magnet schools will be of limited value except to the small number of students who attend them.

## SOURCE MATERIALS

### General Reading on Magnets and Alternatives


Gelles, Jeff, "Selling the Magnet Schools to Parents," *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, September 1, 1976, p. 3A.

Levine, Daniel U. (ed.), *Models for Integrated Education*. Worthington, Ohio: Jones, 1971.

Levine, Daniel U. and Connie Moore, "Magnet Schools in a Big-City Desegregation Plan", *Phi Delta Kappan*, v. 57, no. 8 (April, 1976) 507-509.

"Magnet Schools Short of Goals," *The New York Times*, July 25, 1976, p. 23.

McMillan, Charles and Judith Boroschek, "Elements of Successful Progress," *Schools and Programs of Choice*. Voluntary Desegregation in Massachusetts. Boston, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Department of Education Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity, April, 1977.

Moore, Connie and Daniel U. Levine, "Whitney Young High School and the Renewal of Chicago," *Planning and Changing*, v. 7, no. 4 (Winter, 1977), 148-154.

Waldrip, Donald R., "Alternative and Magnet Programs in Cincinnati."


### Information on Specific Cities


**Houston:**

Campbell, Connie and John Brandstetter, "The Magnet School Plan in Houston, Texas, in Daniel U. Levine and Robert J. Havighurst (eds.), *The Future of Big City Schools, Magnet Alternatives and Desegregation Policy*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1977.

Levine, Daniel U. and Connie Moore, *The Magnet School Program in Houston, Texas: A Description and Commentary*. Kansas City, Missouri: Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education, School of Education, University of Missouri—Kansas City (mimeo), 1976.

**Cincinnati:**

Felix, Joseph L. and James N. Jacobs, "Issues in Implementing and Evaluating the Alternative Program in Cincinnati: in Levine and Havighurst, *op. cit.*

*Cincinnati Public Schools. Annual Progress Report*, November 1, 1976.

*Tentative Recommendations. Citizens' Alternative School Task Force*. February 7, 1977 (mimeo).

**Boston:**

*Schools and Programs of Choice. Voluntary Desegregation in Massachusetts*. Boston, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Department of Education, Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunities, April, 1977.

**Seattle:**

*Student and Parent Preference Surveys of Educational Options*. Seattle Public Schools, March 1, 1977.

**Dallas:**

Chase, Francis S. and Marjorie H. Buchanan, *Appraisal of Progress in Implementing the Concepts of Magnet High Schools in the Dallas Independent School District*. February, 1977 (mimeo).

*A Preliminary Analysis of the Impact Which the Business Community's Efforts Mobilized in Support of the Dallas Plan and the Desegregation Process*. Dallas: Dallas Chamber of Commerce, January 21, 1977 (mimeo).

*Adopt-A-School Dallas Style*. Dallas: Dallas Chamber of Commerce, February 23, 1977.

**Milwaukee:**

*Comprehensive Plan for Increasing Educational Opportunities and Improving Racial Balance in the Milwaukee Public Schools*. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Milwaukee Public Schools Office of Superintendent of Schools, December 8, 1976.

"Chronicle of Race, Sex, and Schools. September-October 1976," *Integrateducation*, v. 15, no. 1 (January-February, 1977), 35.

# APPENDIX A

## Four Types of Magnet Schools in Houston, Texas

### I. Add-On Programs

Specialized classes and staff are added to the existing curriculum in a number of elementary schools and one senior high. All students transferring to these schools for the magnet program are integrated within the regular enrollment. The total school generally participates to some degree in the specialized classes. Classroom space and lower teacher-student ratios limit enrollment.

*Foreign Language Academy:*

One hundred and fifty add-on positions were opened at the Bellaire Senior High School for students wishing to enroll in Hebrew, Chinese, Italian, or Latin. Other languages are taught upon request. Academy students enroll in foreign language class for at least two quarters a year and follow either a vocational or regular college preparatory program.

*Ecology and Outdoor Education Academy:*

This academy at James A. Berry Elementary school combines nature study and a regular curriculum in basic skills. Specialists provide at least one instructional session per week in an outdoor setting for all interested students and teachers, and the science, music and art classes incorporate nature themes.

*Music Academies:*

Three elementary schools offer approximately one and one-half hours of music instruction a day for students enrolled in these add-on music programs. Both individual and group instruction are available.

*Science Academies:*

MacGregor elementary offers a science curriculum emphasizing laboratory instruction in biology, earth science and physical science. Approximately 100 students at the Wainwright elementary school attend special math and science classes during a school day extended to 4:00 p.m. Students are selected on the basis of interest, teacher recommendation, and aptitude in science and math. The program draws on community resource people.

### II. School Within a School

School Within A School (SWS) students participate in specialized programs and only integrate with regular students for a few classes. Participants have been admitted to these programs because of special aspirations or have met other enrollment standards.

*Milby Petrochemical Career Institute:*

This vocationally oriented physical science program stresses career information, interaction with people involved in the petrochemical field, and on-the-job training for each student. The Institute may be either a job training program ending with high school graduation or as technical preparation for post secondary training or education. The Institute began in 1975 with 30 sophomores and by the end of 1976 included grades ten through twelve.

*Sterling Aero-Dynamics Program:* Interest in aerospace careers and background in math and science are the basic prerequisites for students applying for the program's 100 openings. Female and male students are required. The program offers specialized studies in aviation and involves field trips to airports and aero space industries.

*Booker T. Washington School For Engineering Professions:*

Students with superior achievement and recommendations are admitted to this rigorous college preparatory program centering on mathematics and science. A continuous progress plan in math and English, and a schedule with five instead of four periods per day allow students to complete regular high school requirements a year early. Senior courses can be taken for college credit. The program is offered to students starting in seventh grade.

*Scroggins Literature and Art Program:*

Elementary students starting in Kindergarten spend part of each day studying literature and art. There are no student admission requirements beyond parental approval and compliance with the racial distribution requirements for the system.

*River Oaks Vanguard Program:*

River Oaks is one of several elementary school SWS programs for the gifted. A specialized team of fine arts, science, and foreign language teachers helps develop and supervises a variety of electives such as dramatics, debate, chorus, painting, newspaper production, and ecology for the 230 students.

### III. Cluster Center Programs

Cluster Centers integrate students from one-race schools into special programs ranging from one day to a week. In addition, the sending schools receive orientation materials and follow up activities so that the cluster center experience can be incorporated in the regular curriculum when children return to their home school. The goal of cluster centers is to provide enriched education on a part-time integrated basis for racially isolated students.

*People Place Center:*

The People Place at Anson Jones Elementary is organized around the study of diverse cultures. Students simulate the country they are studying.

*Children's Literature Center:*

Children's classics are presented to first, second, and third grade students using puppets, videotaped interviews with children, drama, art, song, dance, and stories. Children attend for four days.

*Career Orientation Center:*

Fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students come to Sinclair Elementary School to learn about careers in foods, communication, business and industry, science, foreign language, travel and transportation. The Career Center emphasizes production, application and operations aspects of the work and careers being explored.

### IV. Separate and Unique Schools

In Separate and Unique Schools (SUS), new programs have been organized around specialized curricula such as health, fine arts, or business. The total school population participates in these programs. Several Separate and Unique Schools, such as the High School for Health Profes-

sions organized jointly with the Baylor College of Medicine, were already established in Houston with outside support prior to the magnet plan; others were regular or traditional schools with newly reduced teacher-student ratios and an explicit added emphasis on discipline and basic skills.

*Fundamental Schools:*

Discipline, grooming (including dress codes), good manners, and grade promotion based on skills mastery are the goals stressed at Looscan and the other elementary and secondary fundamental schools.

*High School for Performing Arts:*

With an enrollment of 550 students, the High School for Performing Arts provides specialized and concentrated work for students talented in art, dance, drama, media, and music. Or those with interest in behind-the-scenes skills such as stage lighting and managing, camera and media technology, costume and scenic design, and set construction. Admittance standards are rigorous and are based on an interview and an audition (dance, music, drama) or presentation of a portfolio (art, photography). A board of consultants selects students for a final interview and matriculation. Artistic progress and academic success are the main criteria for continuing at HSPA. Traditional district secondary courses are offered, but staff members also help establish an artistic curriculum closely associating the arts and academic areas.

*High School for Health Professions:*

Houston and the Baylor College of Medicine have developed a high school curriculum for approximately 350 students interested in medical professions. In addition to traditional courses which fill high school requirements, HSHP aims to provide early level skills to health professions and/or a specialized academic background for continued career or professional training. The campus site is at the Texas Medical Center.

# The Dilemmas of Standardized Achievement Testing

by
Rachel B. Tompkins

Standardized testing is part of the life of schools. Tests may be used to measure a student's ability and achievement; to diagnose reading, math, or writing problems; to identify vocational skills and interests; or to determine who should receive scholarships or prizes. In addition to providing a basis for adults to make judgments about individual children, tests are used to make judgments about groups of children—eleventh graders in Smith High read an average of three years behind grade level; 40 percent of 13-year olds can not balance a checkbook; special education children score below 70 on standardized ability tests.

Whether given to measure ability, achievement, interest or personality, standardized test results reflect all the experience of a person's life. They are imperfect indicators of school performance because results reflect things other than a child's experience in school. For these reasons tests must be used carefully; they must be well designed, and no test result should be relied upon as the single basis for school decisions.

Tests are seriously misused when test performance is used to label. Labeling is not only unfair to the child; it grossly underestimates the ability of schools to help the child grow. Likewise, labeling a teacher "good" or "bad" as a result of student test scores is unfair and underestimates the capability of the teacher to adapt and become more effective. Labeling a school or a district as "good" or "bad" as a result of test scores underestimates the possibilities of improving an instructional program. Perhaps the most serious result of labeling is that labels stick and become self-fulfilling prophecies.

Despite the imperfect nature of tests, students are routinely tested and diagnosed, evaluated, placed or grouped based on test results. This is often done with little attention from the outside world.

Educational professionals at one time welcomed tests as a way to enhance their professional status. It made teaching a "science", gave it a language that laymen did not understand. This allowed testing to be conducted for years without much public scrutiny except for flashes of coverage in those districts that reported low test results. Declining standardized test scores and the pressure for competency testing programs have changed all that. The National Education Association (NEA) and others have called for a moratorium on standardized testing. They assert that test results are often misused and misunderstood. While they cite many reasons for the moratorium, they are obviously concerned about the use of results to evaluate school professionals. The fact that parents, citizens, legislators, and others do not understand some of the language of standardized testing is now used as an argument against more testing as well as a reason to keep test results for schools very private.

While the NEA and others are concerned that there be less standardized testing, there is also an outcry, mainly from citizen and legislators, for more school accountability and more tests to determine the competency of students completing school. Some states have now enacted legislation requiring a certain test score or level of competency for promotion and graduation. Legislative and citizen interest in school outcomes measured by tests will assure the continuation of standardized measures of school and individual success.

If testing is to go beyond labeling, there must be public understanding of tests and their limitations and strengths, and public scrutiny of their use. The concerns of those who wish for a moratorium and of those interested in increased accountability as well as the interests of students will be best served if tests are well designed, properly conducted, accurately interpreted, and publicly monitored.

For these things to happen citizens must be familiar with some of the issues surrounding standardized testing. This chapter is designed to provide beginning knowledge about tests and their use. Special attention is given to standardized achievement tests because they are so frequently used. In addition, the chapter reviews research and legal developments on ability grouping, declining test scores, and competency testing.

## BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT TESTS

### Kinds of Tests

The most frequently used school tests are teacher-made, that is those prepared by an individual teacher and given only to that teacher's students. These tests are used as part of the curriculum and partially determine a student's grade.

A second major category of tests are standardized tests which are created by test companies and given to large numbers of students under the same basic conditions. There are two general types of standardized tests: criterion-referenced and norm-referenced.

Criterion-referenced tests compare a child or a group of children with an absolute standard. Those standards can be general skills areas or specific objectives. Accomplishments, standards, or goals are developed and tests are created to see how well a student does with regard to those objectives. Red Cross swimming tests are a good example of criterion-referenced tests of performance. Standards are set for all swimmers taking the test and a person must be able to accomplish all of the required tasks in order to pass.

Criterion referenced tests have two advantages over norm-referenced tests: they direct attention to instructional objectives, and they reward students for achievement of those objectives and not for performance relative to their peers. Directing attention to how well a school system or a school or a child is accomplishing certain objectives may be much more helpful in improving the educational program than directing attention to comparisons with some other children. The focus is immediately on general or specific skill areas where help is needed.

Norm referenced standardized tests have become the most controversial type of standardized test. They are used to measure ability, achievement, interest, attitude, and other student characteristics.

Norm-referenced tests are a collection of questions usually developed by psychologists working for test publishing companies. The questions are determined by surveying curricular materials and patterns. The test makers try questions out on groups of children who generally represent the population to be tested, e.g. fifth graders. This is the norm group. In the past, pre-testing for many popular standardized tests was concentrated in fairly homogeneous schools. As a result, children who differed substantially from the norm group performed differently on the test and the test was not an appropriate measure for those students. Almost all major test makers now norm tests on diverse populations including city, suburban, and rural students. They include minorities in the norming procedures. Some test makers provide separate norms for big cities.

Scores obtained on each test item during pre-testing are analyzed carefully to determine what percentage of the group got them right. An item which 90 percent of the children complete correctly would be considered a bad item, as would an item which only 10 percent of the normal group correctly answers. Those items would be eliminated from the test. For some skills, test makers want items that 50 percent of the children get right. On other skills, a wider range of 30 to 70 percent might be desired.

The norm does not indicate the score one ought to make, but simply reflects the scores obtained by a group of similar children on the same question. The scores of each group of students taking the test or of each individual are compared to the norm established in the test development process. A group's performance can be evaluated by comparing the distribution of scores above or below the average to the distribution for the normal group.

There are a variety of norm-referenced tests which test different student characteristics. The Stanford-Binet and the Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test are ability tests designed to measure academic potential. They are also called aptitude, intelligence, or IQ tests. Achievement tests such as the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, Stanford Achievement Test, and Iowa Test of Basic Skills are designed to measure accomplishment in subject areas such as reading, math, social studies, and science. The Kuder Preference Test indicates activities a child enjoys more than others. This and other interesting inventories are often used in vocational counseling.

Some tests are designed to be given individually; others to groups. Individual tests are given by a trained professional to one child at a time. They can be scored by that professional immediately. The Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test is this type.

The group tests are multiple-choice questions administered during a specified time period, e.g. 2 hours, to large groups of students. The students mark their responses to all questions on answer sheets which are sent to the company preparing the test and "machine scored" (fed into a computer programmed with correct answers). The company then sends back a report with the individual student score on each sub-test, e.g. reading, and the total test. Various comparisons of the scores are also provided with the results. The student may learn, for example, how his reading achievement compares with the normal group at his grade level around the country or the state or just in big cities. The fifth grade in one school may learn how it compares to all fifth grades in the district or the country.

Certain terms are used frequently in standardized testing circles and are defined here briefly in non-technical language.

**Reliability**—a measure of the consistency of test results at two different testings of the same child or same group. A reliability coefficient of .85 or above is considered good and means that a group of children would be expected to score at roughly the same level at two different settings. Even with very high test reliability, it would not be surprising to find that an individual child's score would vary considerably from one testing point to the next.

**Validity**—a measure of the degree to which a test measures what it is supposed to measure. There are several ways of checking validity each with its own name. For example, content validity compares test items to the established curriculum.

**Raw score**—the number of correct responses by a test taker.

**Derived score**—the translation of the raw score into a comparison with the norm group. These may be grade equivalents, percentiles, or stanines.

**Percentile score**—ranking the raw score on a distribution scaled between 1-100 percent. For example, a raw score of 40 may have a percentile score of 55 meaning that 55 percent of all children taking the test scored 40 or below.

**Stanine**—a grouping of percentiles into a band of scores with a nine point scale. For example:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-3 | 4-10 | 11-22 | 23-39 | 40-58 | 59-76 | 77-88 | 89-94 | 95-99 |

A stanine score of 5 is average.

**Grade equivalent score**—assigns to the 50th percentile score of the normal group on a grade level test a score equal to the grade level. For example, the mid-point on a fifth grade reading test taken during the fifth month of the school year would be 5.5. Scores above and below the mid-point are assigned higher or lower grade equivalent scores. Grade equivalents are the most frequently used derived score and also the most misleading.

Tests are normed for each grade level. A child in the 5th grade scoring 8.2 cannot be said to be achieving at the eighth grade level since he or she took a fifth grade test. Likewise, an eighth grader scoring 5.2 is not achieving at the fifth grade level since he or she took an eighth grade test. One of the most respected testing experts in America, Henry Dyer, called equivalents "a statistical monstrosity".

## Why Standardized Tests?

The major use of standardized achievement tests is as an objective measure of student accomplishment following instruction. Before the measure has any meaning, however, three other very important matters must be considered. These are the first three questions anyone should ask about a testing program.

1. What objectives or standards were established for the instruction?
2. Did the instruction offered actually fit with the objectives and standards established?
3. Did the test given measure what the objectives and the instruction included?

In the absence of objectives or standards, there can be no evaluation of one child's performance or of a school's or district's performance. If the instruction does not match with the objectives, it is both unrealistic and unfair to suppose that a child or a school might achieve the objectives. If the test measures something other than what is taught, then children should not be expected to score very well.

For example, the current enthusiasm for competency measures sometimes focuses on filling out job applications or reading airline schedules. If students see an airline schedule or a job application for the first time when a standardized competency test is given, it is unreasonable to expect them all to master it perfectly. A 30-40 percent failure rate in that situation would not be at all surprising.

## Test Selection

One of the most important steps in insuring careful testing is to make sure that the proper test is used. The plethora of tests are not equally valid for all circumstances or uses. Standardized tests are typically used for the following purposes:

1. Diagnosis and Prescription—what are a child's strengths and weaknesses?
2. Selection and prediction—how well will the child do in a particular program, reading group, or math class?
3. Assessment and Evaluation—are accomplishment levels for the child, class, school, or district at an acceptable level?

Tests which are very good for one of these purposes may not be useful for other purposes. At least the following two sources should be consulted in selecting and evaluating tests:

1. All materials prepared by the test publisher to describe the test and its uses.
2. Oscar Buros' *Mental Measurement Yearbook*. This book prepared by independent critics describes each test, its purposes, the group of students for whom it is appropriate, and other important data.

There are problems in using standardized norm-referenced achievement tests for any of these purposes. What achievement tests do best is predict student success on the next achievement test or the next measure of academic success. They correlate poorly with future success in occupation or income. They are less adequate than other existing tests for diagnostic purposes. They are not as useful for improving instruction as are well designed and carefully administered criterion referenced tests.

## Testing and Evaluation

The effect of every educational reform upon achievement test performance has been emphasized to the exclusion of almost all other measures of success. This has been true whether or not the reform's main purpose was to improve achievement. For example, desegregation has been advocated for many reasons: to eliminate the stigma of separation, to change attitudes, to increase resources available to black children. Seldom has any advocate said, "We need to desegregate so that black children will score five points higher on standardized achievement tests." Yet it is on that measure that desegregation has been most frequently evaluated.

There are serious problems with this approach. The two most serious are:

1. Standardized test scores are a very narrow focus for education programs with multiple goals.
2. Poor and minority children will be more likely to score low on such tests until this country has been engaged in guaranteeing equal opportunity for longer than a few years.

Unless there is a moratorium on the use of standardized achievement tests, it is important to focus on ameliorating these two major difficulties. The narrow-measure problem can be alleviated by expanding alternative measures. Other measures of academic achievement can be used such as daily journals kept by students, portfolios of their work, periodic written assignments by teachers in different subject areas, checklists and inventories. Passing along a folder with samples of a child's work plus teacher assessment is probably much more useful to a teacher in the next grade or another school than are single numbers from an achievement test.

Goals other than academic achievement can be assessed by other measures. Head Start has health improvement goals; Title I, ESEA, Head Start and many other programs aim to increase parent involvement in the child's program; desegregation aims to mix black and white students in equal status situations. Success in these and all other school programs involves far more than reading and computing at grade level. Multiple goals of schooling require multiple measures for success.

For poor and minority children, standardized achievement results provide a Catch 22. On the one hand, it is to the advantage of advocates for children to urge the use of such tests and to cite poor results as a reason for more resources and better programs. On the other hand, if low achievement results continue after schools have added more resources and put in new programs, then school officials may cite the low scores as results of poorness and blackness and something schools cannot change. The temptation is to withdraw the additional support and give up on serving the educational needs of poor and minority children.

A classic example of this problem is the study conducted by David Armour and his associates of the city-suburban transfer program in the Boston metropolitan area (METCO). Armour found that black children who transferred out of the Boston schools to suburban districts did not close the gap existing between their achievement test scores and those of their white peers. That the black students involved were more likely to go on to college, that the dropout rate was low, that the program was growing in popularity were not the measures highlighted from Armour's study. Instead, newspaper headlines reported that busing did not work because the gap in achievement scores remained.

As long as the current variety of standardized achievement tests are used as a measure of success in school programs, this problem will continue. Some actions will help ameliorate the problem, however:

1. Multiple measures of success can be used for all school programs.
2. Criterion referenced tests can be substituted for norm-referenced ones. Criterion referenced tests are less susceptible to single number reporting than are norm referenced. Children, classrooms, and schools may do well in one set of objectives and less well in another.
3. Achievement test results must be monitored over a long period of time for each child. For example, the METCO program might be better evaluated by longitudinal results for children who participate in the program for eight to twelve years.
4. Closing the gap (differences between the averages for the two groups) that exists between black and white children is a completely unrealistic short range goal. Whatever causes the gap has been generations in developing and may not disappear even after twelve years of the best schooling available for all black children. And it may be that closing the gap is not even a good idea. There are many who suggest that even the fairest standardized achievement test measures "white middle class skills" and that no one should expect or want average black scores to be the same as average white scores.

Parents and citizens should monitor school district testing programs carefully to see that multiple measures are used and that unrealistic goals are eliminated. They should support school officials when they become discouraged to seek out and duplicate the many programs that have been successful in improving achievement.

School districts using standardized tests must assume several responsibilities. First, the district should publish a short description of the tests and other measurement devices in use, the ways in which results are used, the schedule for administration and the procedure for the public to follow in raising questions about the tests. Publishing the information and laying it on the shelf for anyone who happens to ask is not sufficient. Wide dissemination of the information to parents, students, the media, and other interested citizens is necessary for public understanding. The process of preparing such a document may require school officials to question whether the use of particular tests actually serves any important purpose.

Second, school districts should create advisory committees composed of parents and citizens who regularly review the testing program and its uses. School principals should also create school advisory committees that review the tests and their uses.

Third, parents should be notified well in advance of the date of any standardized testing to be done on their children. Since a good night's sleep, a nourishing breakfast, and a calm beginning to the day can raise test scores several points, it is essential for parents to know when a test is to be administered. The purpose for giving the test can also be communicated at the same time so that parent questions about the test can be answered before its administration.

Fourth, the results of the test should be communicated and explained to the student and the parent as soon as they are available. Sending home the scores with the test companies' written explanation is simply not sufficient. Even well-educated parents have questions about such things as percentiles and stanines and the meaning of their child's score.

Finally, school-by-school results on standardized achievement tests should be published. The results will actually be grade-by-grade results across schools since the tests are administered by grade level. For example, third grade reading scores can be compared across all elementary schools. The fear of many school officials is that parents and citizens will seize on a single number reported for a school and rank schools from good to bad based on that number. It is not appropriate to use test results in that fashion. Schools cannot be well described by one number any more than children can.

It is possible, however, to learn some very important facts about schools by analyzing test results. For example:

1. Income and educational level of parents are related to test score. Children from poor families usually do not do as well as children from rich families.
2. Analyzing school-by-school test scores ranked by some measures of parents' income will indicate those schools that are different. It will identify schools that are so far below the norms that something must be done. It may identify schools filled with poor children who are doing well. It may indicate schools with some percentage of poor students which have varying scores.
3. Identifying schools (grade levels within schools) that do well in spite of poverty or other problems gives a district some models to use as examples in improving other schools.
4. Identifying schools (grade levels within schools) that have special problems enables a district to reallocate resources to needs. Making the achievement results public means that parents and citizens who care about those schools or special needs can use the information to encourage or pressure the district to act.

Making achievement test scores, particularly those on reading and math, available for each grade by school is one way a district can keep faith with its citizens. Tax dollars support schools; citizens ought to know the results that come from the dollars. Measures other than achievement test scores should be available also. Attendance data, disciplinary actions, drop-out rates, participation rates in school activities, level of parent involvement in educational activities are all measures of the quality and health of a school or school district. Achievement test scores are also one measure and should be reported along with other measures.

## Testing and Diagnosis

Children are sometimes tested to determine strengths and weaknesses in their school skills. In cases where there are problems, individual programs may be developed to address those needs. No program to help can be developed in the absence of knowing the cause, which makes diagnostic testing important to effective education.

The standardized achievement test is an inappropriate test for diagnostic purposes primarily because it lacks very many questions related to specific skills. For example, there might only be one or two questions related to fractions. If a child misses those questions, then a teacher might conclude there was a problem, but would have to ask many more questions to determine the specific area in which the child needs attention.

There are standardized diagnostic tests designed to specify strengths and weaknesses precisely. Many elementary reading and math programs published by major companies have tests that are diagnostic tools. Many can be used by a skilled classroom teacher without assistance from any specialist. In-service training can provide a teacher with the skills to use the diagnostic materials.

In cases where diagnosis of a learning problem is beyond the capability of the classroom teacher, the district should have a procedure for special testing and diagnosis, and development of an individual program for the student. School districts in Ohio either have specialists in diagnostic areas or have access to them through a county district.

### Testing and Selection

Standardized achievement test results are sometimes used to place or sort students into different learning groups. That is, children with similar scores are grouped together for instruction. The theory behind this is that instruction is more effective and easier to do when everyone in the class is roughly the same ability or the same level of achievement. Standardized achievement tests have serious limitations as a tool to sort children into groups.

1. Test results may simply sort out a group different from the group on which the test was normed, e.g. children who speak Spanish or poor children.
2. Grouping on the basis of general achievement levels ignores the fact that one child may do well in one area and poorly in another.
3. Each child varies from day to day and grows and learns in spurts. To label and group based on a single test result may misplace many children.

Regardless of the test used, no grouping should ever be done based on a single test score.

## TEST APPLICATIONS—ABILITY GROUPING

Many varieties of grouping based on test results or achievement levels are possible. Ability grouping will be used here to mean the practice of arranging students in classrooms within a grade, and assigning different teachers to work with these groups at a different pace. Ability grouping may be done by subject or general achievement. Tracking is a special form of ability grouping at the high school level which involves assigning students to certain curricula, e.g. college preparatory, vocational, general studies. At this level, students often select themselves into the program. This "free-choice" is frequently influenced by counselor advice or teacher recommendations which are based in part on test results and by a desire to be with friends who may have been developed in previous ability grouped classrooms. Neither temporary grouping of students within a classroom for part of the school day, nor special education assignments are considered as ability grouping in this article.

### Research

Research results continue to demonstrate serious limitations with ability grouping. The most comprehensive review of research on ability grouping (Findlay and Bryan, 1970) concluded:

1. Ability grouping sometimes promotes improved scholastic achievement with high-achieving students, but seldom promotes improved achievement for average and low-achieving students.
2. Ability grouping tends to reinforce favorable self-concepts of high achievement groups and unfavorable self-concepts in those low-achieving groups.
3. Low self-concept operates against motivation for academic achievement for everyone but particularly for poor and minority children.
4. Poor and minority students tend to score lower on achievement tests and to be judged less accomplished by teachers. Therefore, they are placed in low-achieving groups more frequently than middle-class white children.
5. Ability grouping is widely approved by school teachers and administrators.
6. Most teachers prefer to teach mixed, average, or superior classes rather than low-achieving groups.
7. The greatest harm to children occurs when a teacher favoring grouping is assigned to a mixed class.
8. Socioeconomic and social class differences are increased by grouping.
9. Almost all ability grouping plans depend heavily on tests of aptitude or achievement.

Despite these rather mixed and negative research results, ability grouping retains its popularity. One reason is that it makes teaching easier for those who have superior and perhaps average groups, and the alternatives to grouping require changes in routine and extra work. Some of the alternatives are:

1. Heterogeneous grouping—this involves putting together students who may vary in age, experience, and knowledge, such as a non-graded elementary school.
2. Stratified heterogeneous grouping—this limits the segregation of low and high-achieving groups. For example, a group of 90 students are given a test and ranked in order of achievement. They are assigned by groups of ten to teachers. For example, Teacher A may be given the highest or first 10, the fourth 10, and the seventh 10; Teacher B has the second, fifth, and eighth groups of 10; and Teacher C has the third, sixth, and the ninth group of 10. The groups are heterogeneous, but the range is limited.
3. Team teaching—a group of teachers under the leadership of a master teacher working with a large group of children. Children are grouped for specific tasks with one teacher and regrouped for other tasks with another teacher.
4. Peer tutoring—top students can tutor less able students; older less able students can tutor younger children. Low-achieving tutors are frequently found to gain more than the tutored.
5. Individualized instruction—many patterns exist but unique learning tasks are assigned to a child in a sequence based on that student's characteristics.

Each of these alternatives requires much more organization, management, and instructional planning with groups of teachers than now occurs in many schools. Ability grouping is much easier to do than any of these patterns which encourage or increase individualization of instruction, but it seems less effective in improving learning.

## Legal Requirements

No law or court decision directly prohibits ability grouping. In school desegregation cases, however, courts have looked carefully at grouping practices to see whether they result in racially identifiable classrooms and, if so, whether the result occurred because of discrimination.

Most issues of ability grouping related to school desegregation have come to courts in the South. In the late 1960's school districts attempted to assign students to schools on the basis of test scores. In *Singleton* and *Lemon* the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals prohibited the use of testing in this fashion. The court stated in *Lemon:*

> In *Singleton* we made it clear that regardless of the innate validity of testing, it could not be used until a school district had been established as a unitary system. We think at a minimum this means that the district in question must have for several years operated as a unitary system.

In 1972, the Fifth Circuit considered the use of testing for classroom assignments in *Moses* v. *Washington Parish.* The testing resulted in lower all-black sections which "in an ironic sort of self-fulfilling prophecy, were taught less and learned less". This school district practice was prohibited.

The most recent Fifth Circuit ruling on ability grouping came in 1975 in *McNeal* v. *Tate.* In this case, the appeals court essentially said that any district which maintains racially identifiable classrooms must show that the assignment is not a perpetuation of past discrimination and will remedy past discrimination through better educational results. Given the research on educational results of ability grouping cited earlier it is unlikely that school districts can prove the latter point. The language of the opinion is important:

> Ability grouping, like any other non-racial method of student assignment, is not constitutionally forbidden. Certainly educators are in a better position than courts to appreciate the educational advantages or disadvantages of such a system in a particular school or district. School districts ought to be and are, free to use such grouping whenever it does not have a racially discriminatory effect. If it does cause segregation, whether in classrooms or in schools, ability grouping may nevertheless be permitted in an otherwise unitary system if the school district can demonstrate that its assignment method is not based on the present results of past segregation or will remedy such results through better educational programs.

The appeals court returned the case to the lower court allowing the school district an opportunity to prove that the ability grouping was not discriminatory. The judges also pointed out:

> The district court was in error in assuming that its only alternative to approving ability grouping was to command racial balance in every classroom. If the school district cannot substantiate its present system, it may choose any racially neutral method of classroom assignment it considers educationally sound.

One other major federal court decision, *Hobson* v. *Hanson* in Washington, D.C., relates to the tracking of students. Judge Skelly Wright's opinion in 1967 remains the most exhaustive judicial summary of testing and tracking. Washington, D.C., operated a tracking system at all school levels based on student test scores. There were three tracks at the elementary level—Honors, General, and Special Academic. At the secondary level there were four—Honors, Regular, General, and Special Academic. Judge Wright found educational programs in the General and Special Academic tracks to be "decidedly inferior". He also found disproportionate numbers of minority and poor children in low tracks. Because Judge Wright found the whole system discriminatory, he ordered it abolished. On appeal, the decision was upheld but limited to the abolition of the specific tracking program. The appeals court decision would allow other types of ability grouping that were not racially discriminatory.

Parents have a legal basis for questioning the assignment of their children to racially identifiable groups in any school system. The burden is on school officials to show that such groups are not simply continuing past discrimination in a new form or that the groups are educationally advantageous. In school districts where racial discrimination is not an issue, parents do not have strong legal grounds for challenging assignments. Given the research results outlined earlier, they may, however, have good educational grounds for doing so.

Proving actual discrimination in assignment patterns is difficult. Evidence must show first that there is a high correlation between race and assignment. Then it is important to show that each ability level receives a different type and pace of program; that there is little mobility among groups; that compensatory education is not offered the lower group at a sufficient level to overcome past disadvantages. It is also necessary to challenge the tests used for assignment as inappropriate or that their results are used wrongly.

School districts that receive federal funds under the Emergency School Assistance Act to aid in school desegregation are not allowed to assign students to classes in a segregated fashion. Regulations under the law provide that if racially identifiable classes exist, the burden of proof is on the school district to show that they are not discriminatory. Where this issue has arisen, few school districts have been able to show that their grouping is educationally sound.

The standards used by ESAA to determine whether school systems operate sound ability grouping practices are:

1. Use of non-discriminatory tests relevant to the purpose of grouping.
2. Fair application of standards of assignment to all students.
3. Grouping used only for that portion of the day that is necessary to accomplish its purpose.
4. Special needs of slower students are served by specially developed curricula or specially trained teachers and staff.
5. Retesting at periodic intervals to determine whether students are ready to advance.
6. Presence of valid statistical evidence which shows that grouping as practiced in the district is better for students than other methods of teaching.

Any district in Ohio receiving ESAA funds is required to meet those standards. They are excellent standards for any district whether or not they receive ESAA funds.

### Compensatory Education and Ability Grouping

One of the major arguments advanced to support ability grouping has been that students who are not doing well can get intensive remedial or compensatory services if they are separated from their classmates. One of the problems has been that intensive help has not been given or what has been done has been ineffective. As research shows, low-achieving students have generally not improved when segregated from other students.

Yet the major existing federally funded compensatory program, Title I ESEA, supports a number of local projects that group students in separate tracks for the entire day. Twenty-three percent of all Title I students in the United States are in separate programs for the entire school day. The bulk of Title I programs are of the "pull-out" variety where low-achieving students are separated from their peers for the time they receive remedial instruction (about four hours per week.) Over 60 percent of students are in this type of program.

Separation of Title I students for the entire school day is probably not a good practice given the research on low-achieving ability groups. Pull-out programs may make good sense if students are not stigmatized and if the child can make up regular classroom work easily.

School officials are likely to tell those who inquire about these practices that federal rules require separation of compensatory students. They do not. They require that compensatory services be added to regular programs and that federal funds not be used to replace local funds. Districts must be able to account to the government for the federal funds. Accounting is easier if the students are separated either part or all of the time. Neat accounting schemes do not necessarily make for good educational practice.

## OTHER ISSUES INVOLVING TESTS

Declining scores on certain college entrance examinations and the development of competency testing programs are two issues which have thrust testing into the news. Much disagreement exists among those most knowledgeable about testing as to whether the decline is of any significance. There is likewise no consensus on whether competency testing is a good idea, who should give the test if it is, or how the results should be used.

### Declining Test Scores

Declining scores on certain standardized tests have created many headlines and a fair amount of concern among educators and citizens. Finger pointing and hand wringing have been accompanied by explanations and justifications.

One good source of information on the decline is a report prepared by a panel of experts for the College Entrance Examination Board, *On Further Examination*. These experts concluded that there is no one cause nor one single pattern of causes for the decline. About one half of it can be traced to an expansion of the group of people taking the test. More people who had never considered college began to go on to post-secondary programs in the 1960's and they took the SAT as required by many colleges. By and large, the new students did not score as high as the previous pool of students taking the test.

The panel also suggests that six other developments may have contributed to the decline:

1. Expansion of elective courses particularly in English, writing, and other verbal areas. Along with this expansion has come less attention to "critical reading and careful writing" which are important parts of the SAT exam.
2. Less seriousness of purpose about learning as reflected in tolerance of excessive absences, easier textbooks, grade inflation, and lower standards.
3. Increased viewing of television and other stimulation of children through viewing and listening rather than more traditional reading and writing.
4. Changing structure of the family.
5. Social turbulence of the 1972-75 period.
6. Lessening of motivation to score at the top of the test.

It is also important to note that this group does not recommend returning to more elite days and discouraging those who score lower to stop planning for college. Nor does it suggest tossing out all electives, banning television to children under ten, forcing all mothers back into the homes, and other assorted ways of returning to some past time of innocence. Rather the panel of experts chaired by Williard Wirtz, former Secretary of Labor, is firmly committed to accepting some of these changes and moving on. For example, they say:

> In a sense the schools may have tried so hard to accommodate the special needs of new and unfamiliar students that these very students along with others have been ill served by not being held to demanding expectations of performance. The lowering of teaching sights is the wrong answer to whatever may have been the consequences of the expansion and extension of educational opportunity. The only right answer is to vary the instructional process still more to take account of increased individual differences, but without lowering standards—which we recognize as a form of magic, but one that has been performed in this country for a long time. . . .
>
> Yet we are convinced that television and related forms of communication give the future of learning its largest promise. The most constructive approach seems to us to depend less on limiting the uses of these processes than it does on the willingness of the community and the family to exercise the same responsibility for what is taught and learned this way as they have exercised with respect to older forms of education. . . .
>
> In our view, "returning to the basics" would be wrong unless it included full reappraisal of what the right basics are—taking account of children's different rates and modes of learning and their different interests and plans for the future. The need is not to

revert to uniform drills and exercises commended only by a traditional pedagogy, but to move ahead to a larger emphasis on the fundamentals of learning that can be identified as strengthening the base on which all students can build. . . .

Also, it is important to note that a limited instrument such as the SAT should not become the sole thermometer for measuring the health of schools, family, and student. It tells us nothing about young people's honesty and integrity, about whether they care about each other, or about a lot of other things that matter more than test scores. It would be a mistake to think about such major institutions as the schools and the family solely in terms of their effects on test scores.

### Competency Testing

Many people seem to believe that public schools are not teaching something called basics as well as they did at some previous time. Some called for increased attention to teaching reading, writing, and math. Others call for stricter discipline, dress codes, and traditional classrooms along with more emphasis on the basic skill areas.

At the same time, voices are raised that too many people who are not proficient are graduating from high school and that school policies of simply passing children along from grade to grade (social promotion) have caused this problem. Tests to determine promotion from grade to grade and to determine graduation have frequently been proposed to eliminate this problem of graduating without proficiency in basic skills.

Public concern for social promotion and the seemingly low acquisition of basic skills has moved some states to enact minimum competency programs. Ohio is now considering various proposals for a minimum competency program.

Competency programs vary from state to state. They usually include some of these features:

1. A set of standards, objectives, or specific skills required.
2. Tests to determine whether the standards, objectives, or skills have been acquired.
3. Requirements that students cannot be promoted, or graduated, or receive a diploma if they have not mastered a certain level of skill.
4. Requirements that students must take remedial courses if they do not achieve a certain level.

Citizens should be concerned with a number of issues as the debate on minimum competency proceeds.

1. **Standards**—the standards selected should be those which a diverse population agrees are important for children to attain. The best way to develop the standards is probably through a deliberate and systematic process of discussion which includes education professionals, parents, and other citizens.
2. **Test Selection**—the validity of a competency test is critical. Tests that measure skills other than those actually taught must be rejected. The state or the school district should guarantee that instruction will cover what is to be tested.
3. **Parent Involvement**—a competency testing program should have a carefully thought out process of parent-teacher-student-administrator conferences. These should occur **before** and **after** testing.
4. **Single Test Score**—performance on a single test should not determine promotion or graduation. Other factors must be considered.
5. **Teacher/Administrator Training**—training of teachers and administrators in the use and interpretation of test results must occur before the program begins. Continued monitoring of the effectiveness of school personnel should be established. Specialized assistance should be available to teachers and administrators on request.
6. **Phase In**—a competency program should be phased in at the elementary levels in order not to penalize students who have been in school a number of years with different rules.
7. **Sensitivity to Handicapped and Non-English Speaking Students**—adjustments may be needed in the administration of the test for certain handicapped and non-English speaking students.
8. **Funding**—attention to the seven issues raised requires adequate funding.

These and other issues are discussed in detail in an excellent book called *A Citizens Introduction To Minimum Competency Programs for Students* published by the American Friends Service Committee in Columbia, South Carolina.

## TESTING AND APPLICATIONS IN OHIO

Ohio schools do not differ from most others in the ways in which tests are used. Standards and practices are outlined in this section.

### Ohio Requirements For Standardized Tests

Standards approved by the State Board of Education in Ohio require the use of standardized tests at all levels—elementary, junior high, and high school. The specific standards for elementary school are:

1. A well balanced program of standardized test measures and a variety of teacher-prepared appraisal instruments shall be systematically used to assess and improve the pupil—learning situation. (3301-31-04F)
2. Standardized test results and other data on pupil potential and achievement shall be utilized in efforts to improve instruction. (3301-31-08C)

While these standards anticipate that several measures of student performance would be used, they do mandate the use of standardized tests. If the standard permitted but did not mandate standardized tests, school districts might be encouraged to look more carefully at the tests they use and the purposes to which they are put. It is important to note that the standards speak of using results to improve the pupil-learning situation and to improve instruction. The standards do not suggest that results should be used to evaluate individual children, to label them, to group or track them.

Junior high and senior high standards are similar to ele-

mentary standards, with one significant exception, junior high is the only level mandating group ability tests, i.e. intelligence tests. There is no reason at all to mandate them in grades 7-8-9 and not elsewhere. There is little reason to mandate group ability tests at all.

Intelligence testing has been most abused over the years primarily by assigning entirely too much significance to a single test score. California, New York, and Massachusetts have banned group-administered intelligence tests. Henry Dyer of the Educational Testing Service and other leading proponents of standardized testing seriously question the continued use of these tests. Ohio should remove the standard requiring such tests at the junior high level.

## Annual Assessment

The Ohio General Assembly mandated in 1975 that an annual assessment of students in the state be conducted. The State Department of Education has developed the standards and procedures to be followed.

The Ohio Annual Educational Assessment established performance objectives for reading and mathematics at grades 4, 8, and 12, and for English composition at grades 8 and 12. Criterion-referenced tests prepared by consultants to the State Department were used on a random sample of students in Ohio. The results show how well students at the three grade levels did in achieving objectives in the three skill areas. Results are not available for districts, schools, or individual students. Thus, the results only give the State Department and the Ohio General Assembly a general reading on how Ohio school children do in these skill areas. The Assessment as currently designed does not provide data that could be used to determine promotion or graduation. In fact, the results produced thus far have not yet been used in any way to influence policy.

The Ohio Assessment Committee is holding hearings throughout the state on expanding the assessment to a minimum competency program. The Committee will report to the State Board of Education by summer. The State Board will make recommendations to the Ohio General Assembly by July 1, 1978.

## Ability Grouping in Ohio

The Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education and Welfare requires a sample of districts to periodically file information on the use of ability grouping. The information, reported on the OCR-101 and 102 Civil Rights Survey is available to interested citizens from those districts that file the reports.

An analysis of the reports for 1973-74 indicates that 46 percent of schools in the 82 districts reporting used some form of grouping. Seven of the 82 districts do not use it at all. Some districts are probably reporting temporary groups as well as permanent ones so these figures may actually overstate the use of separate classrooms, separate teachers, and separate curriculums.

Both large districts (60 or more schools) and small districts (less than 20 schools) reported the practice with about equal frequency. Districts with more or less than 10 percent minority student enrollment also use ability grouping with similar frequency. Much variation, however, exists within categories of districts. For example, among the large districts, ability grouping was used in as few as 17 percent of the schools in Columbus and in as many as 67 percent of the schools in Cleveland. Table 1 shows the variation in the use of ability grouping among districts with more than 10 percent minority enrollment. Those districts applying for ESAA funds or those districts with more than 10 percent minority students should look carefully at practices of grouping to be certain they are non-discriminatory.

**Table 1**

**Number and Percent of Schools Using Some Form of Ability Grouping in Districts With More Than 10 Percent Minority Enrollment (1973-74)**

| | No. of Schools in District | No. of Schools Reporting Ability Grouping | Percent of Schools Reporting Ability Grouping |
|---|---|---|---|
| Akron | 66 | 30 | 45% |
| Ashtabula | 13 | 11 | 85% |
| Canton | 30 | 19 | 63% |
| Cincinnati | 106 | 44 | 42% |
| Cleveland | 180 | 120 | 67% |
| Cleveland Hts.-University Hts. | 17 | 4 | 24% |
| Columbus | 168 | 28 | 17% |
| Dayton | 64 | 25 | 39% |
| Defiance | 7 | 5 | 71% |
| Elyria | 23 | 15 | 65% |
| Fremont | 10 | 2 | 20% |
| Green Hills-Forest Park | 11 | 4 | 36% |
| Hamilton | 21 | 19 | 90% |
| Leipsic | 2 | 1 | 50% |
| Lima | 18 | 7 | 39% |
| Lorain | 21 | 11 | 52% |
| Mansfield | 20 | 7 | 35% |
| Old Fort | 2 | 0 | 0% |
| Princeton | 11 | 5 | 45% |
| Shaker Hts. | 12 | 3 | 25% |
| Springfield | 29 | 18 | 62% |
| Toledo | 75 | 41 | 55% |
| TOTALS | 906 | 419 | 46% |

*Source: OCR 101 Forms, 1973-74*

## Testing, Grouping, and Desegregation

The use of tests in a discriminatory fashion becomes an issue in designing court ordered desegregation remedies. Courts will be concerned to avoid within school segregation by race based on test results. Judge Battisti in Cleveland has ordered that the district's testing program be scrutinized and that ability grouping which results in racial segregation be prohibited. It is reasonable to assume that this issue will arise in other districts under court order.

## CONCLUSIONS

Standardized achievement tests have been and probably will continue to be used in public schools for a variety of purposes. The pressures of the competency testing movement assure that. As better tests are developed, current models of norm referenced tests may be used less frequently. If other measures of school success can be encouraged, standardized tests may assume a smaller and more reasonable role.

The quality of a child's education will continue to depend, however, upon caring school personnel who design and implement thoughtful instructional programs in an atmosphere of respect for all parties in the educational process. A good testing program can aid in designing and evaluating the instruction, but it is the instruction and not the testing that is the key to quality education.

## SOURCES


Airasian, Peter W. and George F. Madaus, "Criterion-Referenced Testing in the Classroom", *Measurement in Education*, Vol. 3, No. 4, May, 1972, National Council on Measurement in Education, Office of Evaluation Services, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823.

*Good general comparison of the uses of criterion-referenced and norm-referenced tests.*

Armour, David J., "The Evidence on Busing", *The Public Interest*, 28:90-126, 1972.

Pettigrew, Thomas F., et al, "Busing: A Review of the Evidence", *The Public Interest*, 30:88-118, 1973.

*Analysis and counter analysis of the city-suburban transfer program between Boston and the suburbs. It is an interesting case of the problems in interpreting test data.*

Bryan, Miriam M. and Roger Mills, *Testing . . . Grouping: The New Segregation in Southern Schools*, Southern Regional Council, 1976. 52 Fairlie St., N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303. $2.50, single copies - $2.00, five or more copies.

*Excellent review of some of the same issues covered in this article. Specific steps for parent and citizen organizing on these issues. Description of specific tests commonly used in ability grouping. A glossary of measurement terms is also included.*

Buros, Oscar, Editor, *Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook*, Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1974 and *Tests in Print II: An Index to Tests, Test Reviews, and the Literature on Specific Tests*, Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1974.

*Everything you ever wanted to know about every published test. The yearbook is the best single source of information on Standardized tests of all types.*

*A Citizen Introduction to Minimum Competency Programs for Students*, Southeastern Public Education Program, American Friends Service Committee, 401 Columbia Building, Columbia, South Carolina 29201, February, 1978.

*A non-technical analysis of competency in question and answer format. A collection of other good articles is included, one of which is Henry M. Brickell's excellent piece on the choices and dilemmas of competency testing.*

Ebel, Robert L., *The Uses of Standardized Testing*, Fast Back No. 93, and Vito Perrone, *The Abuses of Standardized Testing*, Fast Back No. 92, Director of Publications, Phi Delta Kappa, Eighth and Union, Box 789, Bloomington, Indiana 47401. 75¢ per single copy.

*Two short summaries of the issues pro and con in standardized testing. Perrone's discussion of alternative systematic evaluation by teachers is useful in thinking through "Why use standardized tests?"*

Findley, Warren G., and Miriam M. Bryan, *Ability Grouping: 1970*, Center for Educational Improvement, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30601.

*Now eight years old, this study remains the best comprehensive review of research in the area. Studies done since its publication continue to support its conclusions.*

Harnischfeger, Annegret and David E. Wiley, *Achievement Test Score Decline: Do We Need to Worry?*, ML-Group for Policy Studies in Education, CEMREL, Inc., Chicago, December, 1975.

*This is a comprehensive look at a variety of factors that influence test score decline. Good source of data on several different tests and changes in scores over time.*

*Ohio Testing Handbook*, Ohio Department of Education, 65 Front Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215, 1977.

*This booklet supports the creation of school testing advisory committees that include parents and citizens, and provides helpful information for such groups. It has a good bibliography of books, articles and resource people.*

*On Further Examination*, Report on the Advisory Panel on the Scholastic Aptitude Test Score Decline, College Entrance Examination Board, N.Y., 1977.


## CASES


*Hobson* v. *Hansen* 269 F. Supp. 401 (D.D.C. 1967), *aff'd sub nom. Smuck* v. *Hobson*, 408 F. 2d 175 (D.C. Cir. 1969).

*Lemon* v. *Bossier Parish School Board* 444 F. 2d 1400 (5th Cir. 1971).

*McNeal* v. *Tate County School District* 508 F. 2d 1017 (5th Cir. 1975).

*Moses* v. *Washington Parish School Board* 330 F. Supp. 1340 (E.D. La. 1971), *aff'd* 456 F. 2d 1285 (5th Cir. 1972) (per curiam), *cert. denied*, 409 U.S. 1013 (1972).

*Singleton* v. *Jackson Municipal Separate School District*, 419 F. 2d 1211 (1969), *rev'd in part on other grounds*, 396 U.S. 290 (1970).

# SPECIAL EDUCATION:
# Implementation of New Rules

by:
Nancy K. Klein

## INTRODUCTION

A great journalist, Henry L. Mencken, once remarked that for every complex problem there was a simple solution. And that solution was probably wrong. Perhaps no where is this more true than in the field of special education, a technique developed to deal with those children euphemistically called "exceptional". While a few of these children vary from the norm by being of superior intellect, most suffer from limitations of learning ability or have sensory, physical and/or emotional problems.

For a great many years our society chose to avert its attention from backward children, to shut them up in back rooms or even to pretend they did not exist. It is only quite recently that a growing awareness of this segment of our population has come to national attention. It has slowly sunk into our collective minds that such babies arrive at the homes of the well-born as well as in the slums, and that they, too, are citizens.

There are two aspects of this situation which may surprise the layman. The first is the extent of the problem. Experts estimate that more than one out of every eight or nine children in the United States (11 - 13 percent) may be categorized as "exceptional". The second aspect that may surprise many is that modern techniques can help almost every handicapped child no matter how serious the problem. That is not to say that educators can make Nobel Laureates out of mentally retarded children, but many skills can be taught that improve their lot and lives. These facts, our democratic philosophy, and recent laws, all require this nation to give every child the right to an education even if he is deaf, blind, mentally retarded or deviant in any other way.

### Definitions

The term "exceptional child" has been used in so many ways that it is easily misunderstood. Some writers have used the term to describe the unusually talented and gifted child. Others have used it to describe any atypical, deviant, or different individual. For purposes of this paper, an "exceptional" individual refers to any child who differs from the normal in any of the following areas: 1) intellectual characteristics, 2) sensory abilities (hearing and sight), 3) physical or neuromuscular imperfections, 4) social or emotional behavior, 5) communicative prowess, or 6) learning abilities.

The techniques which have been designed to teach these children are called "special education." These techniques may be included in the regular classroom or in special classes or centers within a public or private school.

The U.S. Office of Education's Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) administers all federal programs devoted to the education of handicapped children. For administrative and funding purposes, children with special educational needs have been classified in nine categories: 1) mental retardation, 2) specific learning disabilities, 3) auditory impairments, 4) visual impairments, 5) orthopedic or neurological impairments, 6) speech handicaps, 7) behavior and emotional disorders, 8) gifted and talented, 9) multiple handicaps.

These categories include a wide range of abilities and limitations, and only roughly describe a group of individuals whose characteristics and capacities vary widely. The categories do however, provide a useful shorthand to identify the diversity of groups of children who are "exceptional children." Mental retardation, for example, is a label which describes individuals whose I.Q.'s range from 0 to 70. For educational purposes, this group is further subdivided as described in Table 1.

**Table 1:**

**Categories of children who are identified as mentally retarded.**

| Educational Classification | I.Q. Range AAMD* | Psychological Classification |
|---|---|---|
| Educable Mentally Retarded | 55-69 | Mild |
| Trainable Mentally Retarded | 40-54 | Moderate |
| Severe Retardation | 25-39 | Severe |
| Profound Retardation | Below 25 | Profound |

*Manual in Terminology and Classification, American Association on Mental Deficiency, 1973

Individuals with hearing impairments are likewise classified according to the severity of their impairment. The deaf are defined as those whose hearing is nonfunctional for the ordinary purposes of life. The hard of hearing are those whose hearing, although defective, is functional with or without a hearing aid (Kirk, 1972). The age of onset of the hearing impairment, as well as the severity of the hearing loss are critical factors in determining an appropriate educational program for that population.

Persons who have visual impairments are also subdivided into classifications which are educationally important. For educational purposes the visually impaired are those who can read large print; and the blind are those who cannot read print and need instruction in braille.

The complex problems of children with learning disabilities have aroused interest from several professional disciplines including—medicine, speech, psychology and education. In the medical literature, several terms are used to describe this complex population of learners: clumsy child syndrome, minimal brain dysfunction, minimal cerebral dys-

function and hyperkinetic child. Speech pathologists have used terms such as congenital auditory imperception, congenital aphasia, and development language disability. Educators concerned with the lack of mastery of reading skills have identified children with severe reading problems as having dyslexia, specific reading disability, or streptrosybolia (Haring and Miller, 1969). The term perceptually handicapped child was used by Strauss and Lehtinen (1948) to describe perceptual difficulties in children with minimal brain injury. All this terminology was an attempt to describe a group of children whose symptoms varied. The characteristics that they have in common are learning and behavior problems requiring special modifications in instruction in order to master school related tasks.

In 1962 the phrase learning disabilities was suggested by Samuel Kirk and has been adopted into general use by educators to replace all of these other terms. The National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children in 1969 suggested the following definitions which have been adopted in recent federal legislation:

> Children with specific learning disabilities exhibit a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or using spoken or written languages. These may be manifested in disorders of listening, thinking, talking, reading, writing, spelling or arithmetic. They include conditions which have been referred to as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, developmental aphasia, etc. They do not include learning problems which are primarily due to visual, hearing or motor handicaps, to mental retardation, emotional disturbances or environmental disadvantage (Learning Disabilities Act of 1969, p. 14).

The term "learning disabilities" is confusing since mentally retarded children also experience difficulty in learning. It should be noted that mentally retarded children are characterized by more general learning problems whereas the children who would be classified as learning disabled exhibit learning difficulty in a more limited area.

Although definitions of specific learning disabilities vary, authorities agree on four basic elements.

1. The learning problems are specific and not a correlate of other primary handicapping conditions such as mental retardation, sensory handicaps, or emotional disturbance.
2. The child must exhibit erratic growth patterns as well as disabilities.
3. The deficits are of a behavioral nature such as thinking, reading, writing, spelling, speech, language, memory or related abilities.
4. The primary focus of the intervention should be psycho educational and result from an individualized, differential diagnosis (Kirk, 1972).

**Table 2:**

**Handicapped Children in the U.S.***

| | Estimated No. of Hand. Children | No. of Hand. Children Being Educated | Percent of Hand. Children Being Educated |
|---|---|---|---|
| TMR** | 191,063 | 109,175 | 57% |
| EMR | 1,147,803 | 594,646 | 52% |
| HH | 260,981 | 44,430 | 17% |
| D | 45,681 | 20,771 | 45% |
| SI | 2,145,647 | 1,122,232 | 52% |
| VI | 74,718 | 22,718 | 35% |
| ED | 749,441 | 99,400 | 13% |
| C | 183,802 | 63,450 | 35% |
| OHI | 1,089,147 | 165,589 | 2% |
| MH | 35,838 | 9,242 | 26% |

*Source: *State Law and Education of Exceptional Children: Issues and Recommendations*, Weintrab, et. al., 1972

**Key for the Table

TMR — trainable mentally retarded
EMR — educable mentally retarded
HH — hard of hearing
D — deaf
SI — speech impaired
VI — visually impaired
ED — seriously emotionally disturbed
C — crippled
OHI — other health impaired (includes learning disabled)
MH — multiple handicapped

The diversity of their characteristics necessitates individualized programs planned by highly skilled teachers. Not all of the specialized programs needed by learning disabled students require their separation from other children. In many cases program modification can be done in the regular classroom. Regardless of the class context, the children who are the subject of this paper present a challenge to even the finest teacher.

There is great variation within each category of exceptional children as well as between categories. When describing this highly variable group of individuals it must be remembered that exceptional children are first and foremost children. BEH estimates that there are 7,083,000 children less than 19 years old who have special educational needs. Table 2 presents national figures for children with handicapping conditions and does not include the gifted. Although BEH has made a strong commitment to serve children with special needs, the brutal fact is that the goal of full service has not been met. This paper is concerned with the best ways for public education to respond to the needs of this diverse population.

## EVALUATION, CLASSIFICATION AND PLACEMENT

Any classification of a child places a difficult to remove label on that individual which might last throughout a lifetime. Abuses and mislabeling must be actively and aggressively avoided and replaced by precise, technically accurate diagnostic systems which have a purpose.

Although classification can be harmful, diagnosis and classification are necessary to determine the program needed by a child. Classification can therefore profoundly affect what happens to a child, either positively or negatively. It may mean access to services and experiences that will enable him to develop fully, to become a person with a sense of worth and competence, and to experience joy, mastery and

success. If the classification is not appropriate, it may mean failure to get needed and appropriate programs, and, may have such distressing consequences as diminishing self-esteem, alienation from others, and reduced growth and achievement. When a child is classified, it must be done carefully, and for the purpose of securing the best possible services for that individual.

The present categories used to classify children have inherent limitations. They are imprecise, offer insufficient information, and communicate little educational information. Labels such as blind, deaf, or mentally retarded all emphasize only the child's deficits, and describe the child as the source of a problem. These categories and labels have been used to explain school failure, and have affected expectations of children, thereby having negative influence on learning and school performance. Rigid classification has perpetuated stereotypes and myths regarding various types of exceptionality in the eyes of the public and some professionals, which has restricted the development of experimental practices. The existing divisions impede the view of the child as a unique learner, prevent descriptions of relevant educational characteristics, and may limit the child's educational and social opportunities.

It must further be noted that classification of behavior is relative. Judgement of behavior is dependent upon the actual observed behavior as well as the social and cultural settings in which it occurs.

The single dimensional aspects of existing categories pose special problems for children from cultural minorities or those who are multiply handicapped. For children with multiple problems, classification of the child according to one dominant set of problems may result in neglect of other conditions which may need specialized attention. State schools for the deaf or blind have denied admission to children who were blind or deaf and also mentally retarded.

The best systems for evaluating children abandon the classification system and regard each child as a unique individual with his own cultural and social background. An individual plan or "profile" for development is prepared based on input from many individuals and a comprehensive analysis of the child's difficulties and assets.

The "profile" method lists a child's assets and liabilities in a particular setting at a particular time. The profile describes physical attributes and relevant medical, psychological, educational or other clinical diagnostic information regarding the child's parents, siblings, teachers, therapists or other significant adults who influence his development. The settings experienced by the child are described including the classroom and school, neighborhood, church, playground, or even an institution or group home. No single test or battery of tests, and no single person or professional group can do the evaluation. The input of many individuals is required in order to develop a comprehensive analysis of the child's difficulties.

Such a profile of the child's strengths and weaknesses becomes the basis for an individualized instructional program plan. This plan includes specific goals and objectives, identifies skills the child is expected to acquire and any additional expected behaviors, it sets a timetable for achieving these goals, and specifies who is responsible for insuring that the goals are met. Parents must agree to the plans. These profiles are reviewed and revised at regular intervals and programs modified accordingly. This system has been in use in the best programs for a long time. It is now required by law for all programs and all children receiving special education services.

### Mainstreaming—rationale and description

The number of special education day classes for mentally retarded children has increased significantly over the past two decades. This has happened despite the stigma associated with special placement and the fact that studies indicate that mildly retarded pupils progress at least as well in regular classes as in special classes. As one education researcher observed (Johnson, 1962):

> It is indeed paradoxical that mentally handicapped children having teachers specially trained, having more money (per capita) spent on their education and being designed to provide for their unique needs, should be accomplishing the objectives of their education at the same or at a slower rate than similar mentally handicapped children who have not had these advantages and have been forced to remain in the regular grades.

A now famous article by Dunn (1968) was one of the first cries to restore the mentally retarded child to the mainstream of school life. The article observed:

> A better education than special class placement is needed for socio-culturally deprived children who have been labelled educable mentally retarded.

The arguments against the segregation of the mildly handicapped are based on humanistic concerns as well. Our experience with segregated social institutions has shown them to be innately cruel and dehumanizing. A parallel has sometimes been drawn between persons who have been incarcerated in institutions and children isolated and hidden away in special classes in school building basements, although the dehumanization has occurred to a much smaller degree in public schools.

To correct the injustices, negative consequences and isolation that can result from placement in self-contained classrooms, the concept of least restrictive alternative or "mainstreaming" has been promoted by advocates, parents and new legislative action. Mainstreaming, placing mildly handicapped children back into the mainstream of school life, is based upon the principle of "normalization." Stated simply, the "normalization" principle requires that handicapped children's educational services be as much like those of their non-handicapped peers as possible. The principle requires the availability of alternatives to segregated classes for meeting the special needs of mildly handicapped learners. These alternative settings are mandated to "least restrictive environments." The least restrictive setting would insure physical, social and instructional inter-action among all children in a school; modifications of that practice would result from the determination of individual need. Children with special needs spend the majority of their day in the ordinary life of the school. However, children are not simply "dumped back" into regular classes from which they were excluded in the first place.

Moral and ethical considerations regarding the treatment of human beings are central to the issue of mainstreaming. Philosophically, it means that human differences are valued, that all children are unique and learn in varying

ways and at different rates, and that the heterogeneous groupings can be beneficial for everyone. Administratively, mainstreaming necessitates the provision of a continuum of programs and services for children who are experiencing difficulty (whether it be learning or behavior), and reduces "pull-out" programs resulting in special class placement. Educationally, mainstreaming requires specialists to assist the regular class teacher so that the mildly handicapped youngster can succeed in the regular classroom. Recent education trends have brought handicapped children back from their hidden and isolated quarters. In the best schools, they have been given an opportunity to interact with the total school population of which they are a vital and integral part. With the passage of P.L. 94-142, all schools must provide that opportunity.

### Racial Discrimination in Special Education Placement

Minority children are disproportionately placed in special education classes. Whether this is done as a result of racial discrimination or whether placement procedures have this as an unintended result cannot be determined easily.

The Children's Defense Fund examined special education placement for 1972-73 in 505 school districts in five southern states which reported enrollment in classes for the Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR) to the Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). In 51 percent of the 505 districts, the probability of being in an EMR class was ten times greater for a black than a white child. In an additional 37 percent of the districts the chances that a black child would be in special education were five times as great as a white student. The Children's Defense Fund concluded:

> We do not want to state that, based on these facts alone, there were over 32,000 black students in these five states who have been misclassified and misplaced in educable mentally retarded classes. In order to make such a statement we would have to know the proportion of black and white students who should be in EMR classes in each of these districts, a figure which has not yet been derived even on the national level. We do think, however, that it is extremely unlikely that the probability that black students would be in EMR classes should be five or ten times greater than the probability that white students would be in the same special classes. Such facts clearly warrant immediate further examination and investigation by local school officials and federal OCR compliance officials.

Another study of participation in special education done under contract for HEW (Ford, 1975) also noted "the unexpectedly high rates of minority, particularly black children participating in special education." This report examined two possible explanations for these high rates: (1) minority children are more likely to be handicapped; (2) minority children are more likely to reside in school districts which provide more extensive programs for the handicapped. The data used by the researchers, again the Office for Civil Rights 1972-73 reports, do not support either of those explanations. The suggestion, if not the proof of racial discrimination in placement, is strong.

School districts implementing desegregation plans must be particularly aware of the possibility of resegregating students by class placement within desegregated schools. Placement procedures for children should be reviewed and revised if necessary to limit resegregation.

## LAW, POLICY, AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

Nowhere has the examination and clarification of children's rights been more intense than in public education. And as in many areas of children's rights, the conflict between safeguarding interests and insuring rights has required judicial intervention.

Education has long been considered a right for children in America. During the past hundred years, however, numerous questions have been raised in the courts over the interpretation of this right, especially as it relates to compulsory school attendance for children with special needs. Within the last decade, over 40 court cases regarding handicapped children's right to a free public education have been filed and adjudicated.

During the nineteenth and early twentieth century courts left pupil eligibility to attend school entirely to the discretion of the local school boards and administrators. The basis for this position is:

> Since attendance at the state schools is essentially a privilege and not a right, the state may authorize its agents to exclude all children who do not meet the requirements established by the state. Consequently, a school board usually has the implied power to reject applicants for admission who do not conform to the reasonable and necessary requirements established by the board (Zedler, 1974).

This rejection was done with little regard for procedural propriety. The trend is quickly becoming history, however, as the courts have adjudicated inequities regarding the education of the handicapped. These decisions have stimulated the movement to provide educational opportunities to all children regardless of handicapping condition.

### Litigation

All courts that have ruled to date on the claim of handicapped children to a free public education have held that it is unconstitutional to deny any child, regardless of the severity of handicapping condition, an opportunity for an education. Similarly, every state which has enacted right-to-education legislation for handicapped children has provided that no child may be excluded from public education on the basis of his handicap.

Legal action aimed at public agencies to improve services for children with special needs has had notable success. Specifically, two court cases resulted in landmark decisions: *Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children* (P.A.R.C.) v. *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, and *Mills* v. *Board of Education of the District of Columbia*.

Both the *P.A.R.C.* and *Mills* cases mandated substantive and procedural changes in the education of the handicapped. For example, in Pennsylvania the state law which required that all children between the ages of eight and seventeen at-

tend school allowed schools to exempt any child certified by a school psychologist as unable to profit from school attendance. This exclusionary policy condemned severely handicapped children to either state institutions or to remain at home, hidden and forgotten.

In 1971, the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (P.A.R.C.) filed a class action suit challenging the constitutionality of excluding severely retarded children from school. The suit asserted that Pennsylvania's failure to offer educational opportunity to severely retarded children represented a denial of equal protection guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. The suit also asserted that assignment of children to programs for the retarded, unless preceded by prior notice and the opportunity for a hearing, denied them due process.

The decision rendered by the three-judge federal district court in the *P.A.R.C.* case mandated significant changes in policies for the education of retarded children in Pennsylvania. *P.A.R.C.* required that: (1) the state aggressively locate and identify all excluded youngsters; (2) local school districts undertake thorough medical and psychological evaluation of previously excluded children, of children presently in classes for the retarded, and of children recommended for such classes; (3) all children in special classes for the retarded automatically be reevaluated every two years. Perhaps the most significant requirement mandated by *P.A.R.C.* was that all retarded children be placed in a free public program of education and training appropriate to the child's needs and capabilities. Although the final consent agreement did not specifically define appropriateness, it did specify that placement in a regular class was preferable to placement in a special class or special program.

This landmark case, the first right-to-education case for severely mentally retarded children, also set forth substantive guidelines for the conduct of hearings. Procedural safeguards were clearly specified. The court appointed two Masters to oversee the implementation of the consent agreement. Many of the requirements in the *P.A.R.C.* case have been incorporated into recent federal legislation.

The *Mills* and *P.A.R.C.* cases both sought to establish a constitutional principle, that all children, even those who had been excluded from school were entitled to free, publicly supported education. The *Mills* case, however, was brought by plaintiffs who represented a broader range of individuals than had been represented in *P.A.R.C.* The plaintiffs in *Mills* represented students who had been barred from school as "incorrigible" discipline problems and students denied an education because of physical, mental and/or emotional handicaps. The *Mills* plaintiffs hoped to establish the principle that all children, regardless of the severity of handicapping conditions or behavioral disabilities, were constitutionally entitled to a free, publicly supported education.

In August, 1972, the district court provided the relief requested by the *Mills* plaintiffs. The decision required access to publicly supported education for all children and that a due process hearing was necessary for exclusion from school, termination of a special program, or placement in a special program (Kirp, Kuriloff and Buss, 1975). The hearing procedures outlined in the decision, including the requirement of having an independent hearing officer, were quite similar to those in *P.A.R.C.* The judge did not appoint masters, however, and the monitoring of implementation of relief was left to the school system itself. The District has had continued administrative and financial problems which have delayed and hindered implementation.

The judicial perspective has also been sought with regard to testing procedures and special class placement. In many of the nation's public schools, classes for the educable mentally retarded have been burial grounds for minority children from culturally different backgrounds or from homes which have not adequately prepared them for the demands of school. The educational system has consistently ignored pleas to make school experiences more relevant for children, and to honor the cultural diversity of its population. Concerned parents and other agents and advocates for change have turned to the courts in an effort to make the public school system more responsive to children's needs. The resulting litigation has challenged the criteria currently used to label and place children of cultural or racial minority backgrounds in special classes or programs.

Traditionally decisions about placement for mildly mentally retarded children have been made based upon the performance of an individual on a single I.Q. test. For many children, such testing does not accurately measure their learning ability. The tests which have been administered most frequently have been found to discriminate against children of racial and cultural minorities and are therefore in violation of the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution. One study exemplifies the problem. Garrison and Hammil (1971) reported that in five county metropolitan Philadelphia at least 25 percent and as many as 68 percent of the children assigned to classes for the educable mentally retarded were misassigned; they had been misclassified. Nearly all the children were black. These children belonged in regular classrooms not in special self-contained classes for the retarded.

In a landmark case in California, *Diana* v. *Board of Education* (1970), nine Mexican-American public school students claimed they had been improperly placed in classes for the mentally retarded. Each plaintiff came from a Spanish-speaking family and had been tested using English language tests by English speaking testers. Plaintiffs contended the language barrier made the test inaccurate. The case settlement stipulated the observance of the following practices:

1. All children whose primary language is other than English must be tested in both their primary language and English.
2. Such children must be tested only with tests that do not depend solely on vocabulary, general information, or other similar unfair verbal questions.
3. Any school district that has a disparity between the percentage of Mexican-American students in its regular classes and in its classes for the retarded must submit an explanation for the disparity.

The role of parents in placement decisions was the focus of a case in 1968, *Arreola* v. *Board of Education*, heard in Orange County, California. In this case, 11 Mexican-American public school children sought an injunction to prohibit the continuation of special education classes for the mentally retarded until the following reforms were instituted: (a) a hearing is provided before placement as required by the due process clause of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution; (b) the I.Q. tests used to determine placement must recognize cultural differences among students in general and Mex-

ican-American in particular; (c) the classes for the mentally retarded provide an educationally meaningful curriculum; and (d) there is periodic retesting.

An essential element in the definition of the rights of children and parents regarding the use of tests, labeling, and class placement is the concern for safeguarding due process of law. In 1975, a U.S. Supreme Court ruling added great weight to the mandate that public school officials abide by due process requirements in placement decisions. In *Wood* v. *Strickland* (1975) the court held that a school board member engaged in any actions that "would violate the constitutional rights of the students affected or if he took the action with the malicious intention to cause a deprivation of constitutional rights or other injury to the student is personally liable for the intentional or otherwise inexcusable deprivation of the student's constitutional rights."

Prior to the 1970's, educators frequently ignored due process procedures. Decisions regarding class placement, exempting a child from school, changing his placement or even excluding a child were carried forth disregarding legal and fair procedures. Handicapped or exceptional children have been the population most negatively affected by these arbitrary decision making procedures.

The developing case law regarding the rights of handicapped individuals:

> suggest a new conception of the handicapped citizen, a new conception of that citizen's place in our society, a new conception of those obligations owed to him by those who act in place of the society, a conception that suggests that handicapped citizens no longer have what they may have by the grace or by the good will of any other person but that they have what they must have by right. It is now a question of justice (Gilhool, 1973, pg. 609).

## Federal and State Legislation

While the courts have established that handicapped students have the right to public education, states and the federal government have also enacted right-to-education legislation for handicapped students. The decade of the seventies has witnessed significant legislative advances for handicapped children. At the federal level, P.L. 94-142, known as the Education of Handicapped Children's Act (EHA) entitles all children to a publicly supported appropriate education, commensurate with their capacities and abilities, regardless of the severity of their characteristics. This law requires states to provide all handicapped children with a free appropriate public education, provides financial assistance to states, and establishes and protects due process rights for students and parents.

The act defines handicapped children to mean mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually impaired, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, other health impaired children or children with specific learning disabilities. This law is viewed as civil rights legislation and non-compliance is handled accordingly.

## State Plan Requirements

In order to be eligible for federal funds under the act, states must develop annual plans to show how they will comply with the following requirements:

**Full Services**: By September 1, 1978, all handicapped children ages three through 18 must have access to a free appropriate public education. By September 1, 1980, 18 through 21-year-olds must also be included unless inconsistent with state law. Financial incentives are provided for including three through five-year-olds. First priority children are those not receiving any education. Second priority are those, within each disability, with severe handicaps who are receiving some but not all of the special assistance to which they are entitled.

**Due Process Safeguards**: By October 1, 1977, all districts must provide parents and children with the following safeguards:

a. prior notice to parents of any change in their child's program and written explanation in their primary language, of the procedures to be followed in effecting that change;
b. access to relevant school records;
c. an opportunity to obtain an independent evaluation of the child's special needs;
d. opportunity for an impartial due process hearing which must be conducted by the State Education Agency or local or intermediate school district, but in no case by an employee "involved in the education or care of the child." In any hearing, parents have the right to be accompanied by a lawyer or any individual with special knowledge of the problems of special needs children, the right to present evidence, to confront, compel and cross-examine witnesses, and to obtain a transcript of the hearing and a written decision by the hearing officer. Parents have the right to appeal the hearing decision to the SEA and, if they are still dissatisfied, the SEA ruling in federal or state court;
e. the right of a child to remain in his/her current placement (or, if trying to gain initial admission to school, in the regular school program) until the due process proceedings are completed; and
f. the designation of a "surrogate parent" to use the procedures outlined above on behalf of children who are wards of state or whose parents or guardians are unknown or unavailable.

**Least Restrictive Alternatives**: The state and local education agencies must develop procedures to assure to the maximum extent appropriate, that handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped.

There are two child-centered, not system-centered exceptions to this. First, mainstreaming should occur to the "maximum extent appropriate." Judicial and legislative history indicate that "appropriate" is to be defined in terms of what is appropriate for the child, not whether it is convenient for the school system to absorb a handicapped child into the mainstream or whether a handicapped child's presence will have beneficial or detrimental effects on his nonhandicapped peers.

Second, a handicapped child may be removed from the regular education environment if "the nature or severity of his handicap is such that education in regular classes, even with supplementary aids and services, cannot be achieved satisfactorily." Again, this condition focuses on the nature or severity of the handicapped child's disability, not on the

convenience for the school or the consequences for nonhandicapped children.

**Personnel Development:** Each state must develop a comprehensive training program for special and general teachers to carry out the law. Districts must show how they will put the personnel development program into practice.

**Non-Discriminatory Testing and Evaluation:** No one test can be used to determine placement. Tests used must be racially and culturally non-discriminatory both in the way they are selected and the way they are administered. Tests must be in the primary language of the child being tested.

**Individualized Educational Plans (IEP):** Written individualized plans for each child must be prepared and reviewed annually by a child's parent, teacher, and a designee of the school district. This IEP must be attached to the folder of each child receiving additional funds.

The specific educational services required to meet the unique needs of each child must be stated. It must justify the child's educational placement and identify: 1) needed instructional media and materials; 2) the date for initiation of service and length of time required; 3) the extent of the child's participation in regular education programs; 4) individuals responsible for implementing the IEP; and 5) criteria for evaluation of specified instructional objectives. The IEP format has been left to state and local educational agency discretion.

The individualized education program for each handicapped child must include: 1) a statement of the child's present levels of educational performance; 2) a statement of annual goals which describe the educational performance to be achieved at the end of the school year; 3) a statement of short-term instructional objectives; and 4) a statement of specific educational services needed by the child (determined without regard for present availability).

**Other Plan Requirements:** Proposed regulations for P.L. 94-142 require that the state plan also include the following: 1) method of notice of public hearings on plan; 2) evidence that the state has a policy which insures that all handicapped children have the right to a free, appropriate public education; 3) the estimated number of children requiring service; 4) a timetable for accomplishing the goal of full educational opportunity to all handicapped children between the ages of three and 21 years; 5) a description of the kind and number of facilities, personnel and services necessary to meet the goal of full educational opportunity; 6) specification of priorities for service; 7) detailed description of identification, location and evaluation of all handicapped children in the state; 8) description of procedures to insure confidentiality of information collected; 9) a description of LEA school district procedures for developing, maintaining and reviewing individual plans; 10) assurances that procedural safeguards are established; 11) the number of handicapped children in regular classes (least restrictive environment) and those in separate classes or schools; 12) evidence that the state education agency is supervising, administering and monitoring all programs for handicapped children in the state; 13) description of a comprehensive system of personnel development; 14) evidence of use of all federal funds in compliance with the requirements of the act; 15) procedures for annual evaluation of program effectiveness; 16) appointment by the governor of a state advisory panel, (must include handicapped persons, parents of handicapped children, teachers of handicapped children, state and local school officials, and special education program administrators); and 17) a detailed description of the use of federal funds for the handicapped state and local education agency allocations.

## Allocations

Federal assistance is provided to states for educating handicapped students. In 1978, Ohio will receive $11 million in federal support. Fifty percent of the funds received by the state in 1978 may be used by the state to provide direct and support services to handicapped children in accordance with the priorities of the Education of Handicapped Children's Act. The remaining 50 percent goes to local school districts. In 1979 the state may use 25 percent of the funds and distribute the remaining funds to school districts.

The level of federal support is based on an average of state expenditures per pupil nationwide, and the number of handicapped children receiving special educational services. The allocation formula tries to provide federal assistance to support a share of the difference between what a specific state spends per pupil and the average amount spent by all states. The state allocation is calculated after deducting funds received under Title I or VII of the Elementary Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, and any state or local funds expended for programs which would qualify under these titles.

Over the next five years, states will be entitled to a progressively increasing percentage of the average per pupil expenditure. For funding year 1978, the federal government will contribute five percent of the average expenditure while in1982 coverage will increase to 40 percent.

The formula is also affected by the number of handicapped children (HC) between the ages of three and 21 years receiving special education and related services. This provides an incentive for states to educate more handicapped children. However, the regulations also limit the amount any state may receive by putting a ceiling on the number of handicapped children who may be counted. No more than 12 percent of all children ages five through 17 may be counted as handicapped, and the subcategory of children designated as learning disabled may not exceed two percent of the five through 17 population in the state.

The maximum grant to which a state is entitled for the next five funding years (FY) is equal to the number of handicapped children ages three through 21 who are receiving special education and related services multiplied by the following percentages:

For FY 1978 - 5 percent x national average costs x #HC
FY 1979 - 10 percent x national average costs x #HC
FY 1980 - 20 percent x national average costs x #HC
FY 1981 - 30 percent x national average costs x #HC
FY 1982 - 40 percent x national average costs x #HC

## Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504

Another federal act, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504 parallels the requirements of P.L. 94-142. It mandates that the school must either educate handicapped children in regular classrooms or provide them with an appropriate alternative at public expense. In cases where an alternative is used, the school must show that the needs of the individual handicapped child will best be met by placement outside the regular educational environment. "The most normal setting feasible" as conceived in the proposed regulations of section 504 is intended to encompass the same concept as placement in the "least restrictive setting."

# SPECIAL EDUCATION IN OHIO

The current figures on the education of handicapped children in Ohio are contained in the State Superintendent of Public Instruction's report to the Ohio General Assembly. The data were gathered from all school districts in Ohio, the state residential schools for the blind and deaf, county programs for the mentally retarded, and institutions operated by the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation and the Ohio Youth Commission. The report indicates that 164,500 children are served while 83,000 were either not served or not served appropriately.

## Funding Special Education

Several funding models for special education are in use throughout the country. Ohio employs the unit funding model which reimburses school districts for each special education class or unit. This approach reflects the traditional approach to special education in Ohio which uses special classes. The unit need not be limited to that approach; however, special aid is not provided for mainstreaming.

In order to secure a special education unit, a school district must demonstrate the need by identifying the number of youngsters who will be served by the unit. The district must submit a unit request to the State Department of Education, the Division of Special Education. The school district will then be assessed on three criteria: (a) the total population of the district; (b) the number of handicapped youngsters in a particular disability area; (c) the total number of units the district presently operates.

The cost per unit varies among school districts and is determined by several factors. The state formula for reimbursement is: teacher's salary (based on the current state salary schedule), plus 15 percent fringe benefits, plus $4,540. The cost for the average special education unit per year in Ohio is $13,500. This figure varies due to the teacher's salary, transportation costs, or need for additional services.

Special support staff in addition to special education units are funded on a ratio relative to the total school population. Speech therapists, for example, are funded on a ratio of one per 2,000 students. School psychologists are funded on the ratio of one per 3,000 students, and special education supervisors are funded at the ratio of one per 10,000 students. State funds for special education is a form of general aid and their use is not monitored.

## Special Education Regional Resource Centers

Sixteen Special Educational Regional Resource Centers (SERRC), funded by Title VI-B money, have been developed in Ohio as the major mechanism for assisting school districts to work together to meet the needs of handicapped children. To date, the Centers have helped school districts identify unserved children and have funded and conducted in-service training for local school personnel and parents. Several regional diagnostic clinics have been funded through the state to provide diagnostic services for children with special needs. Centers are now required to plan personnel development for both regular and special education teachers for puproses of implementing P.L. 94-142.

## Ohio Legislation

In order to comply with P.L. 94-142, the Ohio General Assembly enacted Amended Substitute H.B. 455, which became effective August 27, 1976. This law stipulates essentially the same substantive and procedural requirements as the federal legislation. There are, however, three areas in which the Ohio law does not parallel federal requirements:

1. All handicapped children between six and 18 are entitled to services. Federal law states between three and 18.
2. Service to mentally retarded children in Ohio is provided by two separate systems. Children with I.Q.'s above 50 are the responsibility of local school districts. Children with I.Q.'s below 50 are the responsibility of County Boards of Mental Retardation ("the 169 Boards"). Federal legislation eliminates such dual systems.
3. Funding from state sources may lag behind what is needed to meet the timetable for implementation in federal law.

A new bill, H.B. 279, mandates full public education for all handicapped children, three through 18 years of age, by September, 1978. It requires that each Local Education Agency (LEA) identify all handicapped children in their district and request the necessary units from the state. In the event the state has insufficient money for the additional units, the school districts will be required to cover the additional costs. The bill was introduced in early April, 1977, and has met with much opposition from some of the local school districts in the State. More recently, H.B. 641, H.B. 642 and H.B. 644 have been introduced which contain amendments to H.B. 455.

## Ohio Annual Program Plans, 1977-1978

Ohio submitted, and the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped approved an amended state program for 1977-78. According to the Ohio Plan, the State Board of Education implements standards and/or guidelines for the following areas: an identification system; placement in the least restrictive alternative; multi-factored evaluation and individualized educational plans; "related services"; trainable mentally retarded; Special Educational Regional Resource Centers; individual school comprehensive special education plan and operational policies; educational programs in institutions operated by the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation and the Ohio Youth Commission; and comprehensive plans for County Boards of Mental Retardation.

The Ohio Plan also states that the standards adopted by the State Board of Education will contain regulations intended to guide LEA operation of special education programs. School districts are required to submit a comprehensive plan for the delivery of special education services to the State Board. Upon State Board approval, the LEA may then apply for state funds to implement and maintain the approved plan.

County Boards of Mental Retardation are designated by the Ohio General Assembly to be an alternative delivery system for the moderate, severe, and profoundly retarded population. Programs operated by them must be established in accordance with a plan submitted to and approved by the Chief of the Division of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities and the State Board of Education. The plan must include funding requests at a level sufficient to

adequately serve the moderately to profoundly handicapped children in their purvue. The County Board programs are being "chartered" by the Department of Education. Teacher certification standards have been approved for teachers of this population.

Project Ohio has been developed by the Ohio Department of Education in concert with the 16 Special Education Regional Resource Centers to locate and identify all children currently not being served by any program. The project has seven components: 1) public awareness campaign; 2) child location; 3) assessment; 4) determination of eligibility; 5) determination of need; 6) placement reassessment; and 7) monitoring and data collection.

The first two steps have been completed. The assessment phase is primarily a local school district responsibility. The standards being prepared will include the elements of placement, assessment, multi-factoral evaluation and individualized education plans. These steps will then be completed upon the availability of the approved standards.

Low Incidence Handicapped (deaf-blind, multiply-handicapped) children will be identified and served through Direction Centers. These centers, with the SERRC network, will develop a case management system and will be expanded to include children in state institutions as federal funds are available. Two centers are in operation, as a cooperative effort among several state agencies.

*Placement*

The State Plan gives placement committees in each school district responsibility for matching handicapped children with appropriate programs. The placement process must utilize non-biased, multi-factored assessment procedures and include an individualized educational plan for each child. Decisions must be made in accordance with the least restrictive alternative doctrine. The placement must be reviewed annually by the school district and parent. Each school district is also responsible for re-evaluating a child's assessment data to determine the child's eligibility under Program Standards for Special Education and to periodically reassess the child's progress utilizing multi-factor assessment procedures.

The Division of Special Education of the State Department of Education will create and chair a statewide management board composed of parents and educators, and representatives of personnel responsible for the devleopment of individualized education plans for handicapped children. This board will oversee and provide direction to four projects designed to assist school districts in developing and implementing Individualized Education Plans.

*Program Funds*

The Ohio State Plan proposes to use Education of the Handicapped Act funds to assure all handicapped children ages six through 18 an appropriate education for FY 78. Those funds not used for school-age children (over six) will be utilized to expand programs to the pre-school population ages three through five.

Handicapped children not receiving education have first priority for FY 78 funds. The Ohio State Plan estimates that 80 percent of the FY 78 P.L.94-142 part B funds will be allocated to the "unserved" handicapped children and to child identification efforts. The most severely handicapped children within this category will be given priority. In addition, priority treatment among the unserved will vary by age in the following order: 1) ages six through 18; 2) ages 19 through 21; 3) ages three through five; and 4) those two years and under.

Handicapped children and youth enrolled in a regular school program who are receiving no special education services have second priority for the FY 78 funds. Handicapped children and youth in a special education program which is too restrictive, incomplete, or lacking in quality to provide an appropriate education have third priority.

The revised plan for FY 78 has been approved by BEH. The amount of money to be generated is uncertain. The most recent estimates indicate a $200,000 increase over FY 77 federal funds.

### Task Force Recommendations

The Ohio General Assembly, recognizing the far-reaching implications of the new federal legislation, directed the State Board of Education to appoint a Task Force to study the management, funding and operations of special education in Ohio, to make recommendations for improvements, and to identify alternatives to the present funding system. The final report of the Task Force was completed January 10, 1977, and transmitted to the chairmen of the Education and Finance Committees of the General Assembly and the Senate as required in the law.

The Task Force recommended, in a general sense, that all actions of the General Assembly relative to programs for handicapped students be taken as a part of the total and comprehensive educational program for all of the students in the State of Ohio. Such a recommendation supports the spirit of federal legislative intent for handicapped children.

The task force report, in essence, recommends to the Ohio General Assembly the steps necessary to provide free public education to all handicapped young people in Ohio from ages three to 21. Their recommendations parallel P.L. 94-142 with specific reference to Ohio. They recommend replacing unit funding with a weighted pupil formula. Their recommendations describe the political and financial mechanisms which will bridge the gap between mandate and implementation of the law and stress cooperation among the existing authorities who serve handicapped children.

## UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

A significant question arises from the new federal and state legislation: Can the federal and state governments deliver the necessary financial resources to local educational agencies so that the fullest intent of the legislation can be realized?

President Ford questioned the federal ability to fund at the proposed levels when he signed the law. The educational agencies responsible for carrying out the law claimed that it imposed heavy administrative burdens. Issues such as due process procedures, state and local dollar split, and the individualized educational programs all have met with disfavor from some sectors. Some have expressed concern over "paper compliance" by some school districts; i.e. submitting the same individual educational plan for all children in a giv-

en class or unit. Unfortunately, the gap between a law and its enforcement, between mandate and fulfillment can be of a significant order of magnitude. Closing the gap where the guarantee of constitutional rights is involved may be a long, drawnout process. The onus of responsibility is upon all professions to implement both the spirit and letter of the law. One unresolved problem affecting the education of the handicapped is the issue of accountability. When education is scrutinized, special education is often singled out because of the excess costs involved in educating the handicapped. When there are budget cuts, special education programs are often the first to be reduced. Even though general education cannot demonstrate its effectiveness and efficiency, special education is usaully required to do so. As special education increases its demands for federal and state funds, there will be an increased demand for fiscal accountability. The claim that special education provides unique methods for unique problems will in the long run have to be validated.

The definition of the term "appropriate" is elusive and remains undefined. Although the term has been used in judicial decisions as well as federal and state legislation, there has been no clear delineation of the concept. How does one determine "appropriateness"? What is the yardstick that can be used to measure it? What is "appropriate" in terms of dollars and cents? Is there a reasonable limit that society should be expected or required to spend for an "appropriate" education? How do we as a society resolve the issue of "competing equities"?

It is truly a new day for handicapped citizens. The hope of an education for all handicapped children may at last be realized. Special educators will be subject to public scrutiny, however, as they prepare handicapped individuals to lead meaningful lives. That outcome is the true test of the implementation of the spirit and substance of the law.

## REFERENCES

### Publications


The Children's Defense Fund. *Children Out of School in America*. Washington, D.C.: The Washington Research Report, Inc., 1974.

Dunn, L. "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded—Is much of it justifiable?" *Exceptional Children*, 1968, 35, 5-22.

Garrison, M. and Hammill, D. "Who are the retarded?" *Exceptional Children*, 1971, pp. 13-20.

Gilliool, T. "Education: an inalienable right." *Exceptional Children*, 38, 1973.

Johnson, G. O. "Special Education for the mentally retarded-a paradox". *Exceptional Children*, 1962, 29, 62-69.

Kirp, D., Kuriloff, P. and Buss, W. "Legal Mandates and Organizational Change". *In Issues in the Classification of Children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Kirk, Samuel. *Educating Exceptional Children*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1972.

Weintraub, F., Abeson, A. and Braddock, D. *State Law and Education of Handicapped Children*. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1972.


### Cases


*Arreola v. Board of Education*, 160 577 (1968).

*Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483, 74 S. Ct. 686 (1954).

*Diana v. Board of Education*, C-70 37 RFP, District Court for Northern California (February, 1970).

*Hobson v. Hansen*, 260 F. Supp. 401 (1967).

*Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia*, 348 F. Supp. 866 (D.D.C., 1972).

*P.A.R.C. v. Board of Education*, 343 F. Supp. 279 (E.D. Pa. 1972).

*Wood v. Strickland*, 420 U.S. (1975).


## AGENCIES AND RESOURCE CENTERS

### To Assist and Support Education Efforts for Children with Special Needs

### Nongovernmental Agencies

1. Alexander Graham Bell Assoc. for the Deaf
   1537 - 35th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007
2. American Assoc. for the Gifted
   15 Gramercy Park, New York, N.Y. 10003
3. American Assoc. of Instructors of the Blind
   711 - 14th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005
4. American Assoc. on Mental Deficiency
   5201 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20015
5. American Foundation for the Blind
   15 West 16th St., New York, N.Y. 10011
6. American Orthopsychiatric Assoc.
   1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019
7. American Printing House for the Blind
   1839 Frankfort Ave., Louisville, Ky. 40206
8. American Psychological Assoc.
   1200 - 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
9. American Speech and Hearing Assoc.
   9030 Old Georgetown Rd., Bethesda, Md. 20014
10. Assoc. for Children with Learning Disabilities
    2200 Brownesville Road, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15210
11. Black Child Development Institute
    1028 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 514, Washington, D.C. 20036
12. Council for Exceptional Children
    1920 Association Dr., Reston, Va. 22091
13. Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf
    4201 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 210, Washington, D.C. 20008

14. Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation
719 - 13th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009
15. National Assoc. for Mental Health
10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y. 10019
16. Muscular Dystrophy Assoc. of America
1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019
17. National Assoc. of the Deaf
2025 Eye St., N.Y., Suite 321, Washington, D.C. 20006
18. National Catholic Education Assoc.
Special Education Dept. 1785 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
19. National Education Assoc.
1200 - 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
20. National Society for Crippled Children and Adults
2023 West Ogden Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60612
21. United Cerebral Palsy Assoc.
66 E. 34th St., New York, N.Y. 10016

## Parent Organizations

1. Closer Look
(Information center for parents of handicapped children)
P.O. Box 1492, Washington, D.C. 20013
2. National Assoc. for Retarded Citizens
2709 Avenue E East, Arlington, Texas 76011
3. Ohio Assoc. for Retarded Citizens
8 East Long St., Columbus, Ohio 43215. 614-228-6689
4 Ohio Assoc. for Children with Learning Disabilities
333 West National Rd., Englewood, Ohio 45322
513-836-0415

## Governmental Agencies

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Advisory Committees

1. National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf
330 Independence Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20201
2. President's Committee on Mental Retardation
South Building, Room 5064, Washington, D.C. 20201
3. Secretary's Committee on Mental Retardation
330 Independence Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20201

Office of Education

4. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
Regional Office Building - GSA, 7th and D. Sts., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202

**Public Health Service**

5. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development
9000 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, Md. 20014
6. National Institute of Mental Health
5454 Wisconsin Ave., Chevy Chase, Md. 20015
7. National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness
9000 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, Md. 20014
8. Social and Rehabilitation Services, Rehabilitation Services Administration
330 Independence Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20201
9. Children's Bureau
330 Independence Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20201
10. Medical Services Administration
330 Independence Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20201

**Department of Labor**

11. President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped
Constitution Ave. and 14th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210
12. Office of Economic Opportunity
1200 - 19th St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

## Special Resource Centers

National Regional Resource Centers (ESEA, Title VII)
A planned network of cooperating Regional Resource Centers that provides diagnostic and prescriptive services for referred students, training and supervision of teachers and aides working in self-contained classrooms and resource centers, and a comprehensive reference service.

1. Regional Development Disabilities Information Center
c/o Waisman Resource Center, Room 213
Waisman Center on Mental Retardation
2605 Marsh Lane, Madison, Wis. 53706
2. National Media Center
Chemical Abstracts Bldg., Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43215

**Special Education Information Center**

SEIC helps parents locate services for their handicapped children. The project is sponsored by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Office of Education, HEW.

3. Exotech Systems, Inc.
1828 L. Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

**Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)**

ERIC is a national information system designed and supported by the U.S. Office of Education to provide ready access to results of exemplary programs, research and development efforts, and related information that can be used to develop more effective educational programs. The ERIC clearing houses most relevant to exceptional children are:

4. Director of ERIC Clearinghouse for Disadvantaged
Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
5. Director of ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education
University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
6. Director of ERIC Clearinghouse on Exceptional Children
Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, Va. 22091

**Council for Educational Development and Research, Inc.**

The CEDAR information office publishes a variety of materials related to education, including the current programs, projects, and products of eleven educational laboratories and nine university-based research and development centers.

7. CEDAR Information Office
775 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203
8. National Center for Law and the Handicapped
1235 North Eddy Street, South Bend, Ind. 46617

# EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS

## English/Social Studies Opportunities Program
## Montgomery County, Maryland

Skilled teacher support, one-to-one assistance, a variety of materials in a resource room setting, and contracting for assignments are all used by the English/Social Studies Opportunity (ESSO) team to provide remediation in a personalized, individualized way in English and social studies. Students are mainstreamed with support from the ESSO team, in other academic and special subject classes. The composition of the team is dependant on the needs and availability of personnel within each school; generally, the team includes the reading teacher, special education teachers and an aide, although frequently student resource teachers and classroom teachers may participate. Only two or three team members are in each class of 25-30 students during a class period. Ongoing assessment of students is used to continuously provide individualized instruction.

*Contact:* Mrs. Mary Theofield, Mark Twain School, 14501 Avery Road, Rockville, MD. 26853

## Progressive Inclusion: Mainstreaming
## Tacoma, Washington

"Progressive Inclusion" is a program built upon a philosophy that the public schools are responsible for the education of all handicapped children. The system is committed to not putting a child in a class and forgetting him. Every child with a handicapping condition in Tacoma has a specific program of inclusion which may range from almost total inclusion in the regular classroom, to a multiply handicapped child's being included because other children come to him. Every effort is made to maintain the child with special needs in the regular classroom. To that end, methods and materials are modified, buildings have been re-modeled and aides and resource rooms are provided. Small class size (maximum 25) and flexible schedules facilitate inclusion of all children. Progressive inclusion utilizes many options, depending on the needs of individual children. The procedures are fluid, open-ended and frequently reviewed and changed.

Tacoma has successfully integrated all types of handicapped children into regular education for the past 15 years.

*Contact:* Dr. Henry Bertness, Asst. Supt. Pupil Personnel Services, Tacoma Public Schools, Tacoma, WA.

## Beachwood Public Schools
## Beachwood, Ohio

Beachwood Public Schools have developed a continuous progress model for the education of their students. This model is flexible and has enabled the administrative leadership to integrate mildly handicapped youngsters. The programs for children with special needs are individualized and can be implemented in regular classrooms, resource rooms or self-contained classrooms. Placement of a child with special needs in the regular classroom is contingent upon the consent of the regular class teacher.

Beachwood's program has been positively received by parents, teachers and students.

*Contact:* Dr. Lee Horowitz, Pupil Personnel Director, Beachwood Public Schools, 24601 Fairmount Blvd., Beachwood, OH. 44122

## Elliot-Pearson Children's School
## Medford, Massachusetts

Elliot-Pearson Child Center, located at Tufts University, is an early childhood program that offers both open education and mainstreamed education for 100 children ages two-and-a-half to six years. Approximately 20 percent of these children are handicapped. A wide range of handicapping conditions is represented in this population, although the range of severity is limited to mild and moderate impairment. The school serves as a training site for graduate and undergraduate students and has an adult to child ratio of 1:4 to 1:5.

Unlike most education programs for children with special needs, this school is not deficit-oriented. To the extent possible, it attempts to utilize the child's strengths in the service of the child's weaknesses, while modifying the classroom program to accommodate the child's difficulties and disabilities.

The program at Elliot-Pearson includes individualized classroom experiences, specialized teaching groups and tutorial sessions for children with special needs. A special emphasis is given to parents of children with special needs.

*Contact:* Dr. Samuel J. Meisels, Director, Elliot-Pearson Children's School, Department of Child Study, Tufts University, Medford, MA. 02155

## Minneapolis Public Schools
## Minneapolis, Minnesota

Special education services are delivered in Minneapolis on an individualized basis. The majority of mildly handicapped youngsters are educated in the regular classroom, with specialized services provided by the resource teacher. The resource room concept was introduced into the system in 1969, at which time there were 44.5 teachers of mentally retarded children. In 1976 there were 17 teachers of the mentally retarded and 78.5 "resource" teachers who serve children with varying special needs.

The student's school of residence is responsible for programming all local in-school special education and community services designed to support the student within his local school and family. The initial referral at the local school goes to a student support team. This team, comprised of the teachers involved, principal and other support staff develop an individualized plan for the child. In the event that additional services are needed for a student, a referral is made to the *Special Education Referral and Co-ordinating Committee.* This group has responsibility for planning specialized, non-local school programs for the student.

The flexible model developed in Minneapolis has been implemented in all three of their school options: continuous progress, traditional and open class. Children move freely from regular class to resource room. The resource teacher works in concert with the regular class teacher to assist the child.

*Contact:* Mrs. Mae Peterson, Special Education Division, Minneapolis Public Schools, 254 South Upton Ave., Minneapolis, MN. 55405

## Staff

Rachel B. Tompkins,
*Director*

Carla J. Edlefson,
*Staff Associate*

Sarah E. Harris,
*Staff Associate*

Susan C. Kaeser,
*Staff Associate*

Laurence T. Mayher,
*Consultant*

## Trustees

Robert Allen,
*Cincinnati*

* Jeffrey R. Bergen,
*Marietta*

Mary Boenke,
*Warren*

Ruth J. Boyd,
*Lima*

* Rowland C. W. Brown,
*Columbus*

Hugh Calkins,
*Cleveland*

O. Eugene Chandler,
*Miamisburg*

Lois Conyers,
*Cincinnati*

William H. Cossler,
*Youngstown*

* Sue Crawford,
*Wooster*

* David L. Genger,
*Cleveland*

* Phyllis Greer,
*Dayton*

* Owen L. Heggs,
*Cleveland*

* Robert J. Julius,
*Toledo*

* Mary K. Lazarus,
*Columbus*

William N. Liggett,
*Cincinnati*

Frank Lomax, III,
*Columbus*

Betty Massa,
*Mansfield*

J. W. McSwiney,
*Dayton*

Charlotte Nichols,
*Cleveland*

Sadie Odom,
*Akron*

Charles J. Pilliod, Jr.,
*Akron*

Mary Rutledge,
*Chillicothe*

* William P. Sheehan,
*Cincinnati*

* C. William Swank,
*Columbus*

Nelson S. Talbott,
*Cleveland*

Joseph Tomasi,
*Toledo*

Alice H. Weber,
*Toledo*

M. Brock Weir,
*Cleveland*

* Indicates membership on the Executive Committee